

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1888.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE ARISTOTELIAN WRITINGS.

On the History of the Process by which the Aristotelian Writings arrived at their present Form, by the late R. SHUTE. Oxford. 7s. 6d.

THIS essay was written for the Conington Prize in 1882. It is matter for deep regret that it was not published at the time and that it now sees the light in an unrevised shape. It is stated in the memoir of the author that 'his intention had been to go over in a thorough way the bases of Aristotelian study. He had got beyond the results here published, but had not time to correct them or record his later impressions and acquisitions.' This being so, disappointment is inevitable.

After a lively statement of the problem, the history of Aristotle's works is traced to the time of Alexander Aphrodisiensis. Any one who takes the trouble to compare the second chapter of Grote's Aristotle will feel convinced that the essayist has the advantage in greater fulness of detail and in a more critical attitude. He tells the Scepis story afresh, but he is careful to point out the variations of the version in Athenaeus. He has one or two novel suggestions: that Polybius got from the treatise *Περὶ φιλίας*, (that is, *Eth. Nic.* viii. ix.) his account of the true succession of constitutions, though without knowing these two books to be Aristotle's: further, that in the Aristotelian works themselves there is no evidence in favour of the supposed quarrel between Aristotle and Isocrates, but a very considerable presumption the other way. Cicero's evidence seems to us somewhat strained, and more might have been made of the undoubtedly spurious works in the canon: e.g. not a word of the *De Mundo* in connexion with Nicolaus Damascenus or any one else.

We pass on to Mr. Shute's original contributions. He very decidedly pronounces the titles of the various treatises, and the

cross-references from one to the other, to be post-Aristotelian. He thinks that the reference-maker was sometimes doubtful either of the authenticity or the value of the work quoted. A noticeable instance of this class, according to him, is the passage in the *Politics*, iv. (vii.) 13, 1332a 7 sqq. *φαμέν δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡθικοῖς, εἰ τι τῶν λόγων ἐκείνων ὁφέλος, κ.τ.λ.* 'Whoever put in that reference,' we read, 'did so at a time when some question had been raised as to the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He himself, apparently, to some extent shared the doubt, whatever it was' (p. 112). What a strange fancy! Why, in the summary at p. 177 of this very essay there is a paragraph beginning in precisely the same way, 'if there be any value in these conclusions,' assuredly without implying mock-modesty or doubt. Mr. Shute also holds that it was the reference-makers who cited the *ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι*, and that by this term they meant the dialogues, now lost, speaking of them slightly and disparagingly in comparison with 'the esoteric and unpublished works' in their own keeping. 'Peripatetic philosophers, in giving their wares to the world, took care to inform that world that they had much more valuable goods in reserve, which could only be obtained by direct initiation and oral instruction. Thus they talk of the dialogues under the general and somewhat contemptuous name of the external doctrine (*sic*), without taking the trouble to specify what special dialogue the doctrine is to be found in' (p. 103). The value of this as an explanation of the distinction between exoteric and esoteric (or acroamatic) is much impaired by the reluctant admission made tentatively and hypothetically, it is true, on p. 167. 'If we adopt the theory that these two books, the books on the best constitution, vii. (iv.) and viii. (v.) of the *Politics*, 'represent Aristotle's finished style, and that nothing unfinished was ever given to the general public during

his life-time or with his consent, we shall arrive at some very convenient results. In the first place we shall be able to admit that there is some value to be given even during Aristotle's lifetime to the distinction between exoteric and esoteric, though of course not precisely that which even our earliest authorities give to it; still less that which later Romanists like Aulus Gellius, or slapdash writers like Plutarch, gave to it. Had Mr. Shute more fully considered this alternative suggestion he might have seen his way to abandoning the other, which rests upon very insecure foundations. He says himself (p. 21) that he cannot attach much weight to Bernays' identification of the 'exoteric discourses' with the dialogues: in fact, we may remark, the identification is open to such grave objections that it is now generally discredited. Taken as a whole, the treatment of the Aristotelian citations appears to have suffered from the hasty composition of the essay. There would have been great propriety in giving a complete list of them with a discussion in detail; there is certainly room for such a list even after the full and lucid statement to be found in the *Index Aristotelicus* of Bonitz, pp. 97-105 (which by some unaccountable slip is three times attributed to Brandis). It would have been as well to examine whether they are of a uniform type, whether they can always be easily detached from the context. Here the contrast with the undoubtedly spurious treatises in the canon is instructive. There are no references in the *De Mundo*, in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, or in the half dozen *Opuscula Varia*. The *De Plantis* alone contains a choice specimen: it was no clumsy imitation of the stereotyped form ὡς περ εἴρηται ἐν τοῖς ἡθικοῖς which gave birth to the monster in *De Plantis* II. c. 2, ad init. ἐκτεθείκαμεν δὲ αἰτίας περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τῶν πηγῶν καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ βιβλίῳ τῷ περὶ μετεώρων, ἐν ᾧ εἵπομεν κ.τ.λ. Such is the happy inspiration which seizes a forger desirous of inserting a reference. Then there are the internal references—the references in a given treatise to the preceding or succeeding portions of it, which are far more numerous than the citations of other treatises. Take the *Politics*: it refers six times to the *Ethics*, once to the *Poetic*, twice to the *ἑωτερικὸι λόγοι* and, as Mr. Shute thinks, three or four times to the *Oeconomica*. (This is an enigmatic remark: besides 1330a 3, 33, the former a doubtful case, Bonitz gives no other reference to the *Oeconomica*. Possibly Mr. Shute had in view 1326b 33, 1335b 4.) These

are all the cross-references in the *Politics*, but some 140 internal references have been enumerated, mostly of the type *supra*, *infra*, *alio loco*, and at least a dozen of them are unfulfilled promises, so far as the extant treatise is concerned. Now to separate the two classes of references and to treat exclusively of the one seems undesirable. However that may be, since 1882 Birt's treatise has thrown fresh light upon the publication of ancient books. The most conservative of critics will now readily admit that the division into books is not Aristotle's, and that when the system of publishing larger works in a number of separate rolls was once introduced it was very natural to supply, where necessary, transitional passages from one 'book' of a treatise to another. Andronicus, or whoever subsequent to this change brought out an edition of Aristotle, may very possibly have done this in certain cases. Nay more; if he brought out a complete edition he may have inserted, or completed and supplemented, the system of cross-references, and his ὑστερον or πρότερον may denote no more than that he adhered to a fixed order. But this requires to be established in detail, and Mr. Shute has by no means made out his case that the references frequently involve mistakes as to doctrine or fact. More important is it to insist that all this, which may be conceded, is hardly any ground for modifying our previous views as to the nature of the text. It is incontestable that most of the writings subsequently called Aristotelian received some sort of publication in pre-Andronican times; that the treatment of a subject by the master and the school was from the first kept distinct; that a course by Theophrastus on First Philosophy or Politics or the history of Physical Doctrines, or a course by Eudemus on Physics or Ethics, was at the time in no danger of being mistaken for, or confounded with, one by Aristotle. Had it been otherwise surely we should have had more anachronisms, as we see by the *Historia* and *De Causis Plantarum*.

Coming now to the repetitions in the text, Mr. Shute did most valuable service by publishing in *Analecta Oxoniensia* the duplicate version of *Physics*, B. VII. On p. 119 he condemns both versions as spurious. But what becomes of his theory as to their origin when we find in the catalogue of Diogenes Laertius this double entry, (45) *περὶ κινήσεως* α, (115) *περὶ κινήσεως* β? Must we not infer, with Diels, that the library whence Diogenes' authority ultimately de-

rived his catalogue already possessed the 'first text' and the 'second text' of *Physics* B. VII., which we hear of in Simplicius? If so, it was not between the times of Alexander Aphrodisiensis and Simplicius that the double text arose (or, as Mr. Shute would say, the one text was differentiated into two): on the contrary, the two texts are carried back to the Alexandrine age: this is admitted for Diogenes' catalogue (p. 93). Thus one way of accounting for repetitions fails the first time it is tried. Next it is applied to the two texts, as they are called, of the *Politics*. This seems unfortunate. There is hardly a vestige of evidence that rival schools of commentators ever took up the *Politics* in the way in which Alexander, Themistius, Philoponus, Simplicius and others worked away at the *Physics*: and it is not to the labours of rival schools, but rather to time and careless copying, or the revision of Byzantine pedants, that one would ascribe such discrepancies as are found in the *Politics* between two classes of manuscripts, or between all extant manuscripts and the *Versio Antiqua*. Mr. Shute is on his own ground, however, when he shows from *Physics*, VII. (p. 127 sqq.) how, when two texts had in whatever way arisen, the copyists were sure in the course of time to make confusion worse confounded by 'contamination'; how the variant was certain to creep first into the margin and then into the text. This, which is all excellent, is then applied to the far more complex case of *De Anima*, II. III., whether rightly or wrongly remains to be seen. The last two chapters of the essay are intended to exemplify the positions previously laid down, especially as to citations and repetitions, by a closer examination of the *Ethics* and *Politics*. The latter work is said to consist of two parts, six books of political lectures and the 'finished (*sic*) tract

of the Perfect State.' Here, strange to say, the analysis might have been carried further. Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 459, n. 3) at once fastened on book E, on *Revolutions*, as a separate treatise: nor is the connexion of books Δ Z either with the first three, or with 'the tract of the Perfect State,' one whit less obscure than the connexion between those two portions of the work themselves. Are we then to amend Mr. Shute's 'certain result' and say that the *Politics* is made up, not of two, but of *four* independent treatises of different classes? Before this be done it is worth while to weigh well the indications pointed out by Susemihl some time ago, and quite recently by Mr. Newman, of unity of plan and structure pervading the work, although none of its various parts fits exactly with the others. For example, the writer who sketches a perfect state is found to embody exactly the good points which are praised, and to avoid exactly the bad points which are censured, in the constitutions reviewed in B. II. The essay supposes that the two books containing a sketch of the Perfect State 'whoever was their author, were not written as part of the general course to which the remaining books of the *Politics* belong.' Then how to explain these 'undesigned coincidences'?

We take leave of this essay with the conviction that it is creditable to English scholarship. It is not probable that it would have won acceptance for its conclusions, even if published while they were held as yet unchanged by the writer himself. But it really grapples with its subject, it sets the reader thinking perforce, and displays qualities as rare as they are intrinsically valuable in research of this kind, originality to seize novel points and courage to follow out every hypothesis to its conclusions.

R. D. HICKS.

ROSCHER'S MYTHOLOGICAL LEXICON.

ARTICLES ON ROMAN RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.

THESE articles form only a small portion of the twelve parts of the Lexicon which have as yet appeared, and are altogether inferior in interest, and perhaps also in workmanship, to the extensive mass of writing on the Greek deities so elaborately and ably criticised by Mr. Farnell in recent numbers of this Review. A long delay seems to have occurred in the publication of the thirteenth

part, which is to contain an account of the Italian Hercules; and this delay may mean, it is to be hoped, that as the more important figures in the Roman religion are approached, the contributors are taking greater pains, and the editor exercising his rights with greater vigilance.

For in spite of the labour bestowed on some of the articles, and the learning brought to-

gether in them, it is hardly possible even for the English student to feel satisfied with the work as a whole. The writer of this review, having been engaged for some years in a study of the old Roman life on its religious side, naturally looked forward to the appearance of each part with the expectation of being saved much trouble, and of learning much in the way of method which might lead to increased accuracy and a sounder habit of judgment in questions where accuracy and judgment are the scholar's most essential qualifications. Looking back upon the use that he has been able to make of the *Lexicon* so far, he is obliged to confess that, though he is greatly indebted to it in certain particulars, *e.g.* for references to modern periodicals, and for much trouble saved in handling the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, he has not gained from it nearly so much as he had hoped, at any rate in the study of those articles which deal more particularly with the history of the older and genuinely Italian forms of the Roman religion.

It may be that this is as much the result of the nature of the subject, as of the shortcomings of the writers; for there is nothing in the world more difficult than to draw up a succinct and yet complete account of subjects which are often so obscure and almost always so teasingly complicated as are for us the religious ideas of the Romans. But it is a fact that the modern German scholar does not, as a rule, get the better of his materials as did the masters of an older generation, such as were Ambrosch, Schwegler, Preller, and Marquardt. The material it is true has grown, in quantity if not in quality, and those great writers were not so liable as the present generation to have the edge of their minds blunted by the incessant perusal of ill-written 'Forschungen,' which cannot be entirely neglected, but weary and distract the mind, and insidiously habituate it with misleading methods and illogical ways of reasoning. These four scholars, together with Mommsen, brought our knowledge of the older Roman religion up to a point which cannot be greatly improved upon until a fuller and more certain light is poured upon it from other regions of research—from anthropology generally, from comparative philology, and especially from Etruscan and Celtic mythology and language. No amount of delving among the old materials will produce much more that is valuable. There is plenty of opportunity for web-spinning, but little chance of getting at truth. And this is exactly the reason why the articles on the older religion are so inferior in value

to those which deal with the pseudo-religion of the Empire. In the latter case, the material is for the most part really new, and the work consists largely of compilation and inference from the vast stores of the volumes of the *Corpus*; in the former, the real material is old and well-sifted, but often very meagre, and rendered very difficult to work upon by the deposit overlying it, which has been brought down by a stream of indifferent researchers, since the days when it was first opened up by the labours of men in all respects worthy of the name of scholar.

Before criticising some of the most important articles, it may be as well to mention two main shortcomings which seem to affect the value of the work as a whole. The first of these is the uncertainty of the method applied, and the consequent want of a clear order in the arrangement of the matter. Not unfrequently the article narrowly escapes being an unintelligible jumble; yet if there is one thing which is a *sine qua non* in a dictionary, it is orderly clearness. Now Marquardt, a most experienced hand and the safest guide in this kind of work, laid it down long ago that in Roman religious antiquities, rich in cult but poor in mythology, the true method is to proceed *from the cult* to the spiritual conception underlying it. When Marquardt laid down this rule for himself, he was perhaps mentally contrasting his own object and method with that of Preller, which was very different and less strictly scientific; but he was at the same time enunciating a truth which is based on the very mental and moral fibre of the Roman character itself. To put it shortly, you can only get at what the Romans thought about their gods, by examining what they did in worshipping them. Even then you cannot get very far; for ritual is very difficult to interpret, and there will still be a thick veil between you and the inner sanctuary of the Roman mind; nor can you easily form an idea as to how much or how little that sanctuary may have contained. Half a century ago, in a short treatise, the fine quality of which still commands respect, Krahner declared it impossible for us moderns ever really to discover the inner religious life—or whatever was the equivalent for a religious life—of the ancient Roman. To this weighty and unimpeachable maxim scholars have not held as they should have done; and perhaps only one of the writers of these Roman articles (Wissowa) has really learnt the '*difficillima ars nesciendi*.'

The second shortcoming that invites criticism is the confused style of writing which

pervades many of these articles, and which results chiefly from an over-abundance of citations inserted in parentheses, not only at the end, but in the middle of long sentences. Here again the work of Dr. Wissowa shows that it was not impossible to avoid confusion, by strictly keeping in mind the object and limits of a dictionary article, and distinguishing between what is really necessary and what is under the circumstances superfluous. The result is that his articles are for the most part finished work, easily intelligible, and worthy of the editor of the last edition of Marquardt's volume on the Roman 'Sacralwesen': while many others are not only most unpleasant to read, but look more like extracts from the writer's commonplace-book than maturely thought out *résûmés* of our existing knowledge of the subject-matter. R. Peter is the worst offender perhaps in this way, though he has done in other respects some of the best work in the Lexicon. Take his article on *Dis Pater*: the first sentence, twenty-five lines in length, is almost wholly made up of a cloud of parentheses, containing a great variety of citations, ancient and modern, out of which the eye has to pick, with most unnecessary labour, the small fragments of the main sentence, which appear and as suddenly disappear, like the streams in the limestone of Mantinea. In one case a parenthesis actually incloses another one—an atrocity which is perpetrated more than once in the articles by this writer. There cannot be a doubt that such confusion could have been avoided by any one who had a little patience and a modicum of literary skill. It is indeed just this lamentable absence of literary skill among the learned Germans of to-day that is degrading the quality of their work, and is likely to give the palm, at some future time, to the French scholars, who are steadily improving in thoroughness, yet retain the lucidity which is natural to them. For literary skill does not only imply neatness of style, but also clearness of thinking and the capability of mastering materials; and as it has been in the past, so in the future those works will live and be of most use in the world over which most pains have been taken by the most skilful workman.

The simplest way to deal with the various articles will perhaps be to take them in groups according to their respective writers. The Roman work has been mainly done by four of these, viz. Wissowa, R. Peter, Birt, and Steuding. Rapp has written on the Furiae, Drexler has contributed some useful work in the later numbers, chiefly on monu-

mental evidence, and to Professor Meltzer, the Carthaginian specialist, was entrusted, perhaps with doubtful discretion, the account of Anna Perenna.

As has been already said, the most masterly work is undoubtedly Wissowa's, but there is unluckily too little of it. His articles on Angerona, Consentes, and Consus, are models of clearness and good sense, and in these, and also in a little group of notices under letter C, he sets an excellent example by pointing out the present limits of our knowledge, and by declining to be enticed into the fairyland of pure hypothesis. In writing, for example, of the obscure goddess Carna (a subject about which a good deal of dust has been raised of late by O. Gilbert in his book on Roman religious topography) and also of Canens, he judiciously remarks that it is and always will be impossible to distinguish in Ovid the genuine folk-tale from what may be the invention of the poet's fancy. All these articles too are readable, and not overloaded with citations and parentheses.

There are, however, two contributions of Wissowa's which seem to invite a few words of respectful criticism, viz. those in which *Dius Fidius* and *Favunus* are respectively handled. In the former of these two articles there are two assumptions which seem to detract from its value. Abandoning his usually cautious method, Wissowa starts with the assertion that *Dius Fidius* is the *Genius Iovis*, and this assertion is surely not proved, as he imagines, by the false etymology of *Aelius Stilo* (*Diovis filius*, in Varro, *L.L.* 5, 66), nor yet by the alleged discovery of Reifferscheid that *Hercules*, underlying whose personality we may certainly look for *Dius Fidius*, was also the *Genius Iovis*. Unluckily Wissowa has forgotten to tell us where Reifferscheid's discovery is to be found, and it is still more unfortunate that a fellow-contributor, Birt, in his article on 'Genius,' has emphatically laid it down that the idea of the *genius* of a deity belongs to a comparatively late period, when the Romans had become familiarised with anthropomorphic notions of their gods, and applied to them the same strange doctrine of *genii* which they believed of human beings. Perhaps these inconsistencies will be cleared up in the important article on *Hercules*, which however, we regret to say, is not being written by Wissowa. The other assumption, that *Dius Fidius* = the *Fise Sansie* of the great Iguvian inscription, may very possibly be sound, but it is rejected by at least one learned editor of that inscription (Bréal), and it is hardly strong enough to justify

the dismissal of 'Fisius' in this Lexicon with a mere reference to the article we are considering.

In his account of Faunus, Wissowa has, we think, taken a wrong view of that mysterious being, though it is a view for which a good deal may be said. Like most Germans, he makes Faunus a single deity, derives his name from 'favere,' and sees in him, as Faunus Lupercus, the god of the Lupercalia. We may leave the etymology alone, though if Wissowa had read Professor Nettleship's chapter on 'The earliest Italian literature,' he might have found reason to modify his views both of the derivation and the nature of Faunus. But we must point out that the combination 'Faunus Lupercus' is a very doubtful one, resting directly only on the authority of Justin, and that it is by no means certain whether the Lupercalia and Faunus had anything to do with each other; and secondly, that if Faunus was a single deity, and not a multiple semi-deity, it is necessary to conclude (as Wissowa does) that wherever in Latin literature *Fauni* appear, they are importations from Greece—a conclusion which leaves the Romans without any representatives of those wandering, prophetic semi-deities, so powerful for good or evil, which are common to the mythologies of every other people. There is, at least, some evidence that the plurality of the *Fauni* was a belief of *rustic* folk in Latium, *i.e.* of those who would be least affected by Greek ideas, and it is doubtful whether the Greek Satyr would have taken root in Italy if he had not at least had a predecessor whose place he might occupy. Lastly, Wissowa is obliged on his hypothesis to find a very lame reason for the curious fact that there is not extant a single votive inscription to Faunus, a fact which may be explained without difficulty if we trust the Romans themselves, and conclude that, except in the fancy of the Graecising poets, Faunus was never really a god in the proper sense of the word. The difficulty of distinguishing between what is Greek and what is native in the Roman religion is of course enormous; but as in Greek art and religion we are now-a-days compelled to pull up and reflect that it could not *all* have come from the East, so in Latium we must always allow for a certain substratum of ideas, which were not borrowed from Greeks, Etruscans, or Gauls, but were common to those and to other peoples.

The contributions of R. Peter would be of a far higher order than they are, if he were a little less pedantic and a little more mer-

ciful to his readers. These faults have been already commented upon; in other respects high praise may be accorded him. As a collector of 'Stoff' he shows to the greatest advantage in the long but excellent article on Fortuna, the best thing ever yet written on the subject. He does not trouble himself to determine whether Fortuna was in her origin a goddess of the Dawn, the Sun, or the Moon (the two latter theories, it may interest Prof. Max Müller's readers to know, have been suggested by M. Gaidoz and O. Gilbert respectively), but gives a full and valuable account of all the many localities and forms of her cult. Some of these, *e.g.* that of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, are extremely interesting and very tempting to an incautious theorist: but luckily Jordan's well-known paper on the Praeneste worship was published just before this article was written, and the hesitation of that great scholar probably kept Peter from being too venturesome. Very interesting also is the account of the later identification of Isis with Fortuna and Panthea, on which Drexler adds a valuable appendix to the article, illustrated by wood-cuts from the monuments; and the latter part of the article constitutes in fact the best extant commentary on the famous sentence of Pliny (*N. H.* II. 22), in which the universality of the Fortuna-cult in his day is so strikingly recorded. Only in the reference to the myth of Fortuna does there seem room for a word of criticism: Peter has not tried to explain the connexion of Fortuna with Servius Tullius, as might seem natural, and as was suggested by Deecke in his edition of Müller's *Etrusker*, by identifying her with the Nortia of Volturnus, who may very probably have been brought by Mastarna to Rome. The other articles by the same writer are of the same useful character, but spoilt by pedantry. The three columns of the article '*Damia*' are almost entirely occupied with a collection of the opinions of German scholars during the last quarter of a century; if this were really what is wanted, what will the dictionary of the next century be? The article *Epona* is good, but Peter seems just to miss the interesting point. How did it come about that this deity from the north secured a footing in Italy? From the east came plenty, from the north and west hardly any. *Epona* was undoubtedly a horse- and mule-deity, and was indigenous in the mountainous region of Central Europe; and it may have been that the importance then, as now, in the Alpine passes of beasts of burden, whose owners worshipped

this goddess, brought their protecting deity south of the Alps. Peter also writes a sufficient account of *Avernus*, but holds to the old derivation from *āopros*. It may be worth while to point out that Dr. Guest, in the first chapter of his *Origines Celticae*, proposed a Celtic etymology of this word, which seems to have escaped the attention of scholars.

Birt treats of *Ceres*, *Dea Dia*, *Diana* and *Genius*. The last of these is a useful piece of work, and the facts brought together in it may be of use to anthropologists. It is perhaps just as well that its writer is not an anthropologist himself, and does not attempt to trace the development of the doctrine of *Genius*. He deduces it indeed, rightly no doubt, from the belief in a life after death; but in the primitive idea of such a life it was the body and not the soul that survived, and who shall say at what point the Roman belief grew out of this elementary notion? The account of *Dea Dia* is carefully worked up from Henzen's *Acta Frat. Arv.* but, as the task was not a difficult one, might have been turned out with greater finish. The other two articles, and especially that on *Diana*, are open to serious objection. *Diana* is, we are told at the outset, derived from the root *di*, to shine; she is therefore 'a goddess of the clear heaven' (through *dium*), or 'of the clear day' (through *dies*). With the moon she has nothing to do, as we used to think, nor is she the feminine form of *Janus*. Now these conclusions rest largely on the assumption that the 'i' in *Diana* was originally long, and on this point there is at least some uncertainty. The etymology in fact of this and kindred names is not yet sufficiently established to justify Birt in basing his account of the goddess entirely on his own view of it. (Cp. Jordan's cautious note on Preller, i. 313.) He requires us, for example, to put down everything in her cult which seems to connect her with the moon, as derived from the worship of *Artemis*. In writing of the cult of *D. Nemorensis*, described by Statius (*Silv.* iii. 1. 55), he will have it that her festival took place by *day* and not by *night* (in spite of a torch-procession), because Statius uses the words 'jam dies aderat.' And he seems to have persuaded himself that the connexion of *Diana* with the animal and vegetable world is easier to explain on the hypothesis that she represents the sky rather than the moon. All this may be true, but it is not proved by Birt's reasoning, which rests on the etymology alone. Even in the same author's

account of *Ceres* it would have been as well to take the cult first, though the etymology of the name is certain. After showing that the cult is entirely Greek and simply that of *Demeter*, the question would naturally arise as to the substitution of the name *Ceres* for that of the Greek goddess. Birt explains this by assuming that *Ceres* meant originally *bread*, and that the plebeians, who were specially concerned in the worship, invoked the foreign deity by the word which expressed the national needs supplied by her; rejecting Henzen's identification of *Ceres* and the *Dea Dia* of the Arval brotherhood, and neglecting the unquestionably spiritual rather than material meaning of kindred words in the Umbrian and Oscan dialects. We prefer to think that *Ceres* was the name of a goddess before *Demeter* arrived; but on such a point as this every one is free to maintain his own opinion.

A great proportion of the work has been done by Steuding. To him has been entrusted the writing of short notices of the numerous Teutonic and Celtic deities whose names appear in inscriptions from Britain, Gaul, Switzerland, &c. Some few articles of more importance have fallen to his share, and of these one (*Feronia*), is excellent both in the ordering of the matter and in the method pursued; though we must add that it was hardly necessary to account for the connexion of a 'collegium aquatorum' at Aquileia with this goddess, by reverting to the cloudy theories of Kuhn and Schwartz, and making her a development from 'a motherly deity of cloud-water.' Steuding's work is however not always to be relied upon, as the editor himself seems to have discovered; for he has allowed R. Peter to make so many additions and interpolations in the article on 'Ferentina,' as to render it a jumble quite unworthy of a place in any good dictionary. Dr. Roscher has also, it is greatly to be regretted, allowed two bad blunders to stand in the article on *Flora*, which must go some way to destroy our confidence in his editorship. In a well-known and valuable paper on Italian Myths in the *Rheinisches Museum* (vol. xxx.), H. Usener made a singular mistake which has been taken over bodily with all its consequences in this article by Steuding. Wishing to show that nine months elapsed between the conception of *Mars* by *Juno* and his birth on March 1, Usener asserts that *Ovid* tells the pretty folk-tale of that conception under date of June 2; and Steuding has not troubled himself to verify the reference, which is, it need hardly be said, to the 5th, not the 6th book of *Ovid's*

Fasti, and is to be found under date of *May 2*. Again, in writing of the *Floralia*, he is guilty of wholly misconstruing a passage of *Valerius Maximus* (ii. 10, 8), in which the story is told how Cato the younger declined to stay at these games and witness the customary undressing of the 'meretrices.' Moved by his withdrawal, says *Valerius*, the people reverted to the 'priscus mos' of the festival, i.e. gave up a disgusting practice which had grown up with the corruption of society. Steuding noticed the words 'priscus mos,' and jumped at the conclusion that *Valerius* meant that this undressing was itself a really primitive custom. Will it be believed that he is actually drawn on by this blunder to suggest that this immodest stripping was symbolical of the fall of the blossoms 'nach der Befruchtung?' Perhaps these are only two examples among many of the way in which attention is drawn now-a-days away from the ancient texts themselves, and devoted to the consideration of what has been written about them by the learned German world of to-day. If such a process were allowed to go on for long, the honest search for truth would become impracticable and hopeless.

Though it is impossible to avoid disappointment with a good deal of the work presented

to us in these articles, and equally impossible to feel that it has in all cases realised the expectations raised by the editor's original preface, we may gladly acknowledge that our dissatisfaction is based quite as much on defects of form as of matter; and bearing in mind the extreme difficulty of treating subjects so complicated in a limited space, we may readily allow that many of them are handled as well as could be expected from men whose natural bent is not in the direction of succinct compilation. And as was said at the beginning of this review, there are already some signs of improvement. The work is moving more slowly, which may mean that *Dr. Roscher* has begun to realise the vast amount of labour entailed on the editor of such a *Lexicon*. The addition of *Deecke* to the staff is a great accession of strength, though it will need all an editor's care to avoid confusion between the conclusions of an Etruscan specialist, and those of scholars who have studied Roman worships without a very complete knowledge of other Italian religious ideas. Lastly, we may repeat that for all the later aspects of the religion of the Roman world, this *Lexicon* contains the best work that has as yet been published.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

OLD-LATIN BIBLICAL TEXTS.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (q) with a Fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna. Edited, with the aid of *Tischendorf's Transcript* (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury), by *HENRY J. WHITE, M.A.*, of the Society of St. Andrew, Salisbury. With a Facsimile. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 4to. pp. lvi. 166. 12s. 6d.

THIS, the third part of the *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, issued by the Clarendon Press, contains, as the title indicates, the text of the *Codex Monacensis*, known since *Tischendorf's* time as *q*. It formerly belonged to the monastic library at *Freising*, which has the distinction of being mentioned in the Preface to the Authorised Version of the Bible, where it is referred to as containing *Bishop Valdo's* translation of the Gospels into 'Dutch rhyme.' The monastery was founded by *Corbinian* († 730) about 724;

the library by *Bishop Hitto*, fifth in order from *Corbinian*. The present MS. was probably there from the first, as it bears no library marks except that of *Freising* and its present Munich number (*Lat. 6224*).

The text is printed from *Tischendorf's* transcript, carefully revised with the MS. by *Mr. White*. It is written in semi-uncials of the seventh century (although *Tischendorf* assigned it to the sixth), and in double columns. The initial sentences of the Gospels and of the chapters into which each Gospel is divided are marked by capital letters outlined in ink and ornamented in colours, without gold, the two or three lines following being also written in colours. The initials are also frequently adorned with figures of birds, and the blank spaces at the end of the chapters are similarly adorned with figures of birds, beasts, and fishes. The last page is ornamented with a cross, in the head of which is a half-length portrait of a man (intended for the scribe

himself), and in the centre the subscription 'ego ualerianus scripsi.' Such signatures in Latin MSS., not only those of Irish or Saxon, but also those of German origin, appear from the instances cited by Wattenbach and Mr. White not to be so uncommon as Silvestre supposes, at least from the seventh century. The scribe adds, 'quia tribus digitis scribitur et totus membrus laborat.' Similar expressions more or less ungrammatically expressed are quoted by Wattenbach and Mr. White from many MSS., for instance, 'scribere qui nescit nullum putat esse laborem; tres digiti scribunt totum corpusque laborat.' One writes: 'O quam gravis est scriptura; oculos gravat, renes frangit, simul et omnia membra contristat. Tria digita scribunt totus corpus laboret.'

The MS. appears certainly both from the writing and the ornamentation, as well as the style of the subscription, to have been written in Germany; it deserves notice therefore that the word 'apparitio,' supposed to be a Spanish expression, occurs in a marginal lectionary note as = Epiphany. We must infer that the term was not exclusively Spanish.

Faults of orthography are common. Some of these may be due to careless pronunciation, such as *abuisti*, *ospes*, *hired*, *habuit*, *ueneri(t)*, *accesserun(t)*: but many are certainly due to careless writing, especially the repetition or dropping of letters, the latter occurring chiefly though not exclusively where the same letter recurs after a short interval; ex. gr., *aspiens* for *aspiens*; *ailli* for *ait illi*, Mk. ii. 14; *hierolyma*, *mistravimus*. Compare the counter error in: *farisisei*, *patitentiam*, &c. Such errors as *cū exercito suo* (Lk. xxiii. 11) are rather grammatical. *qūm* as the contraction for *quoniam* is noticeable; *thensaurus*, *puplianus*, *adulescens*, *Moyse*, occur regularly; *nequa* (which occurs also in *g* and *s*) is judged by Bishop Wordsworth to be an old indeclinable noun.

Two later hands have been employed on the MS., one of the eighth or ninth century, the other of the fourteenth. The latter, besides correcting faults in orthography, has supplied the names appropriate to some of the roughly-drawn figures of animals.

The order of the Gospels was originally the usual Old-Latin order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, but the binder, with the perversity of his race, has made a violent attempt to change the order, even cutting the vellum leaves for the purpose. As some of the pages contained the end of one Gospel

and the beginning of the next, he has only succeeded in producing confusion.

As to the text, Dr. Hort classes the MS. among the Italian class, viz., that 'due to various revisions of the European text, made partly to bring it into accord with such Greek MSS. as chanced to be available, partly to give the Latinity a smoother and more customary aspect.' It would thus be classed with Brixianus (*f*) rather than with Vercellensis (*a*) or Veronensis (*b*). Mr. White, after a most careful analysis, arrives at a somewhat different conclusion. He considers that, although in the underlying Greek text *q* may run with *f*, in its Latinity it represents an older type, agreeing sometimes with *a* against *b*, more frequently with *b* against *a*; sometimes presenting genuine African readings, and now and then those of *D*, while occasionally it stands alone.

As to reading, for example, in Matt. v. 11, it reads (with *f*, *Am.*) *propter me*, not *propter iustitiam*.

Matt. xi. 23, *quae usque ad caelum exaltatae*, not *numquid*, &c.

It omits, Jno. v. 4 (the stirring of the pool at Bethesda), and in Jno. ii. 3 it omits *quoniam finitum erat vinum nuptiarum*.

As to renderings, Mr. White takes as a test of affinities the renderings of certain words, such as *δοξάζω*, *ἐντιμῶς*, which are subject to a great variety of treatment. Thus *δοξάζω* is rendered in different MSS., *clarifico*, *glorifico*, *honorem accipio*, *gloriam accipio*, *honorifico*, *honoro*, *magnifico*. Our MS. *q* has in S. Matt. (with one exception), and throughout S. Luke, *magnifico*; in S. John and S. Mark (where the word occurs but once), and once in Matt., it has *honorifico*. Now in the latter chapters of S. John *b* has *clarifico*, but in all the other instances it agrees with *q*, while *f* often has *glorifico*. The rendering *clarifico* in *b* and *f* is curious, being distinctly of African use. *ἐντιμῶς*, again, is rendered in eleven different ways, not reckoning *arguere* of Cod. Usser. Of these renderings six are found in *a*, seven in *b*, four in *f*, and seven in *q*. In the first nine instances *q* and *b* agree, changing together from *impero* to *praecipio*, *increpo*, *prohibeo*. *f* has in Mark *comminor* eight times and *increpo* once; while in Luke it has *comminor* once and *increpo* eleven times, whereas *b* and *q* have *increpo* throughout S. Luke with one exception, where both have *impero* (*imperavit febrī*, iv. 39). In Mark *q* agrees once with *f* against *b*, twice with *b* and *f*, and four times it differs from both. But in Matt. it agrees with *b* in all

(seven) instances, although four different words are used.

If we take the Gospels in the ancient order (John not having the word) we find that, with one exception, the disagreement with *b* commences with Mark, iv. 39.

Such tables are very valuable to those engaged in tracing the affinities of MSS.

We may notice the following readings or renderings:—

Matt. iii. 9, nolite preferre uos dicentes intra uos (*a* conflate reading; *b f* have nolite preferre uos dicentes, *a* and *Am.* ne uelitis dicere intra uos).

Matt. v. 11, exprobauerint = *t* (male-dixerint *k Am.*).

Matt. v. 13, (sal) fatuatum fuerit (euanuerit *a b Am.*, fatuum fuerit *f*).

Matt. vi. 19, erugo et tineæ et comestura (conflate, erugo et tineæ = *a b* and *f* nearly; comestura = *k*).

In S. John the revision is more complete, and the agreement with *f* is greater.

John i. 48, we have arbore fici (ficulnea *f*, arbore ficulnea *b*).

John i. 32, testatus est (testimonium perhibuit *a f*; testificatus est *b*).

In John ii. 2, the addition *ὅτι συνελεύθη ὁ οἶκος τοῦ γάμου* is excised in *q* and *f*, though found in *a b* and *r*. In ii. 9 again the shorter form of the verse is found with *f* against the European addition 'et uidentes factum mirabantur' of *a, b*. On the other hand in iii. 6, while the addition 'quia deus spiritus est' of *a, r*, &c. is excised, the European addition 'quoniam de carne natum est' found in *a, b, r*, &c. remains, though excised in *f*.

In John ii. 9, we have 'ignorabat' (nesciebat, *a, b*, non sciebat, *f Am.*).

John ii. 15, pecunias = *a* (aes *f Am.*; nummos *b*).

John ii. 22, rememorati = *a, b* (recordati *f*).

John iii. 1, Nicodemus nomen eius [nomine *N, b (f Am.)*], cui nomen, *N. a*.

John iii. 25, factum est ut fieret quaestio (facta est ergo *q. a [b] f Am. &c.*).

Luke xiii. 19, Simile est granum synopsis quod accepto homo misit (= *a₂*).

Mark ii. 17, non egent fortes = *b* (non opus habent sani *f*).

Mark ii. 21, adsummentum = *d Am.* (additamentum *f*. Other MSS. have insumentum, commissuram, iniectionem).

It results on the whole that *q* cannot be classed with any one definite branch of the Old-Latin family, but has come under the influence of every group in turn. As Mr. White remarks, the comparison of mere test-passages is fallacious, because these would be the first which would altered by a reviser. It is the minor agreements which show the affinity of the MS.

I may take this opportunity of drawing attention to certain fragments of an Old-Latin version of the Apocalypse, published in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, t. xlv. 1883, by M. Omont, from the MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. No ancient MS. has hitherto been known containing the Apocalypse. Belsheim's MS. *Gigas Holmiensis* is of the thirteenth century. Sabatier's text is extracted from the *Commentary* of Primasius. The fragments in question are palimpsest of the sixth century, and contain on ten folios parts of the Acts and on two a fragment of the Apocalypse (i. 1-ii. 1; viii. 7-ix. 12). The MS. was known to Sabatier, but he has not given its variants except in two chapters of the Acts. The text agrees closely with that used by Primasius. M. Omont in the paper cited expresses his intention of publishing the text of the fragments of the Acts, together with a palaeographical account of the MS. in a notice on the uncial MSS. of Fleury (from which library these leaves came). I cannot say whether this notice has been published or not.

T. K. ABBOTT.

MUELLER'S NONIUS.

Noni Marcelli Compendiosa Doctrina, emendavit et adnotavit LUCIAN MUELLER. Part I. Books I.-IV., pp. VIII. and 699. Leipzig: Teubner. 20 Mk.

At last the first instalment of Prof. L. Mueller's long-promised edition of Nonius

has appeared. It consists of a preface of four pages, followed by the text of the first four books, with an *apparatus criticus*, and a very short commentary. The remaining books are to follow, with *Adversaria* discussing the mutual relation of the MSS., and the merits of the various readings sug-

gested by successive generations of critics. Prof. Mueller tells us in the preface that of all scholars within the memory of men he feels himself most unfairly treated by destiny. He has had to cleanse not one, but three Augean stables, to wit, Lucilius, Ennius and Nonius. His labours over the last of the three, which have occupied no less than twenty-five years, would have been much lightened had he felt himself contending with foemen worthy of his steel, such as Bentley or Lachmann. Instead of them he has had to encounter only a Gerlach or a Quicherat. Still, in spite of this discouragement, he has persevered, and now at last we have Nonius, not indeed converted from an idiot into a scholar, yet so greatly altered for the better, that it is hardly possible to recognize the old Nonius in the new. From the preface we turn with eager anticipation to the text, but as we read on and on we can scarcely help feeling a certain sense of disappointment. Professor Lucian Mueller's work has no doubt made a distinct and considerable advance in the criticism of Nonius, but there is still room for an edition, which may make a further advance of no less distinct and considerable a character. The requirements for an edition of Nonius, which could be considered as in any sense final, would seem to be the following: (1) A discussion of the sources on which Nonius drew for his materials; (2) a conspectus of the passages where the words explained by Nonius are discussed by other grammarians and commentators; (3) a list, complete as far as possible, of all existing MSS. of Nonius, with a discussion of the relations in which they severally stand to one another; (4) a full and accurate *apparatus criticus* giving the reading of all those MSS. which cannot be shown to be derived from some other extant MS. How far then are these requirements fulfilled in the present edition? The question as to the sources of Nonius Prof. Mueller proposes to treat in the forthcoming *Adversaria Noniana*. We may however infer from certain statements in the commentary, that he regards large portions of the first two books as taken directly from Gellius, a view which Prof. Nettleship has shown to be perhaps more than doubtful. The second of our requirements Prof. Mueller seems entirely to ignore. So far from attempting to give a complete list of parallel passages, his references to other authors, who have discussed the same words as Nonius, are few and far between. In order to deal with the two remaining points, it is necessary to say a few words about the

material at our disposal for constituting the text of our author. The extant MSS. earlier than the fifteenth century, containing the whole or part of Nonius, are fifteen in number, and fall naturally into four groups: (1) those which contain the whole, viz. F (Florence, Medicean xlviii. 1, books I.-III. only), H (Harleian 2719), L (Leyden, Voss F 73), P (Paris 7667, except from p. 140 M. to the end of the third book), V (Wolfenbüttel Gud. 96); (2) those which give the whole or part of all the books except the third and fourth. To this class belong the Bamberg MS. M. V. 18, Leyden, Voss 116, Paris 7666, and the Zurich fragment; (3) Montpellier 212, Paris 7665 with Berne 347 and 357, and Oxford Bod. Can. Lat. 279. These MSS. give extracts from the whole work, with the exception of the third and ninth books, and alter the usual order of the books; (4) Geneva 84, which contains the whole of the fourth book, the Ely MS., of which Bentley gives a full collation in his copy now in the British Museum, also containing the whole of book IV., and Berne 83 with extracts from the same book. Prof. Mueller reserves his description and classification of the MSS. for his *Adversaria*. Some indications of his views however may be gathered here and there from the present volume. He says for instance in his commentary on the title and index, '*apparatus olim titulum in H adfuisse, cum P totus sit ductus ex illo.*' In both these statements he is mistaken. P is not a copy of H. On this point no one who has collated, or indeed looked at P, could have any doubt. H again never contained the index of books. Of more than fifty MSS. of Nonius that I have examined, the only one, besides L and P, which now contains the index, is a fifteenth-century MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. In F, and perhaps in V, it originally existed but has been completely erased. So too on 80, 31, where H²PV have *Cecilius*, FH²L with the extract MSS. *Celius* or *Caelius*, he says, '*diu meditato visum est membrarum potiore sequi fidem,*' and writes *Caelius*. Now, as Prof. Havet has pointed out, the MSS. authority points the other way. Indeed statistics show that where H²PV are opposed to FH²L the chances in favour of the former group giving the better reading are more than nine to four. The criticism of the text of Nonius falls naturally into three divisions: (1) Books I.-III., (2) Book IV., (3) Books V.-XX. It is with the first of these divisions that the present article proposes to deal. The MSS. containing the first three books may be gathered into the

following groups, arranged in order of merit: (1) F³(H¹); (2) H², P (to 140 M), V; (3) F¹, F²(H¹), L¹, L²; (4) the extract MSS. All the above MSS., except H¹, are entitled to rank as independent authorities, since it can be shown that no one is derived from any other. Of the entire MSS. Prof. Mueller gives the readings of H, L, V only; F and P he omits altogether. Of the extract MSS. we have a collation of the Bamberg, with occasional references to the Leyden and the Montpellier. The others, including Paris 7665 and 7666, are practically ignored. Even these MSS. Prof. Mueller has not collated for himself. For the Harleian he relies partly on a collation made for him by Prof. Sievers (Hs), partly on one published by myself in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Ho). The latter, as Prof. Mueller pointed out at the time, was not so complete as it might have been, still comparison will show that Ho is at least as trustworthy as Hs.

The collation he publishes of L, which is extremely accurate, and perhaps needlessly minute, he owes to the kindness of Prof. Zangemeister. The readings of V, which are far from correctly given, he quotes partly from the edition of Gerlach and Roth, partly from a collation by Schneider. Indeed, a reviewer, who wished to be rude, might possibly feel justified in applying to him the words of Laberius, which he himself uses of that great scholar Prof. Buecheler, *Alienum adpetonibus viae expeditae* (v. note on 74, 6).

Into the text Prof. Mueller has, as might have been expected, introduced a large number of conjectural emendations. It is impossible adequately to discuss the proposed readings within the limits of the present article. A few instances however may be mentioned, where a want of personal familiarity with the MSS. seems to have led him to adopt a reading against the best manuscript authority, e.g. 7, 19 he reads:

Périi! flocco habebit tibi iam iam illic homo lumbos meos from H¹, which has *habebit tibi amillic*, as against *habebit tam illic* L¹, *habebit iam illic* F², H², L², P, V, Bamb., Par. 7666, Leyd. 116. The reading of H¹ is however simply a copyist's error, arising from a correction in F, which gives *habebat am illic*, altered by the second hand to *habebit iam illic*. 12, 18 he adopts *ancillulam unam*, a suggestion made by myself from the *ancillunam* of H¹. The conjecture has however no MS. support, as *ancillunam* is nothing but a clerical error on the part of the scribe. F has *ancillulam*, and the correction in H is almost certainly made by the first hand. 15, 7 he gives

Quid ita? tamne obscurè dictumst tāmue inenodābile?

The MSS. have *quid tam* F³(H¹), *qui tam* F¹, *qui itam* L, *quid itam* H², P, V, *obscuridicunt* F, H, L, P, V. It seems safer to adopt Mercier's suggestion *obscuridicum*, and read

Quid tam obscuridicum tāmue inenodābile?

It should be noticed that F³ has *quid tam*, and in questions of reading the authority of this MS. far outweighs that of all the other MSS. combined. The *variae lectiones* of the MSS. may perhaps be best explained as arising from *quit tam*, another form of the original *quid tam*. ib., 14, he reads

Gnate ordinem omnem, ut ut erit, enodā patri.

The MSS. give *gnato* F², H, L², P, V, *gnato* F¹, *gnito* L¹, *enodat* F, H, L, P, V, *pater* F³(H¹), *patri* F¹, H², L, P, V. Thus the best manuscript authority seems to be in favour of reading *gnato ordinem omnem* . . . *enodat pater*. *Pater* is supported by F³, *gnato* and *enodat* by all the MSS., and it appears at once unnecessary and rash to have recourse to any alteration. Many similar instances might be given, but the above, all of which occur within the compass of eight pages, may perhaps serve as a specimen.¹ The printing and general get up of the book are, as might be expected, excellent. There are however one or two points where an improvement might perhaps be suggested with regard to the arrangement. It is difficult to see why Prof. Mueller does not print the prose, as well as the verse, quotations in a separate type, in order to distinguish both alike from that part of the work which is due to Nonius himself. The *apparatus criticus* again would be more convenient to consult had he given the MSS. readings by themselves, apart from the *conjecturae doctorem*. It would also be an advantage to distinguish those passages which occur also in the extract MSS. from those which are found only in the entire MSS. It seems ungrateful to criticize a work on which so much labour has been spent, and which contains so much that is valuable. At the same time, while thanking Prof. Lucian Mueller for what he has given us, I cannot help regretting that he was prevented from adding to his other undoubted qualifications as an editor of Nonius that of a personal acquaintance with, at any rate, the most important MSS.

J. H. ONIONS.

¹ A series of criticisms on a large number of details will, I hope, appear in the next number of the *Journal of Philology*.

Aristophanis Plutus: annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit **FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES:** Halis Saxonum, in Orphanotrophei Libraria: 1886. 9 Mk.

Aristophanis Acharnenses: annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit **FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES:** Halis Saxonum, in Orphanotrophei Libraria: 1887. 10 Mk.

MR. BLAYDES in 1886 reached the *Plutus* in the somewhat arbitrary order he has followed in his edition of the separate plays of Aristophanes—almost the first edition of the comedian which is at the same time complete and original. The *Plutus* is undoubtedly the easiest of the plays to edit as to read: if the editor comes into direct comparison with Hemsterhuis and Porson, he has their collections, critical and exegetical, to aid him: and Mr. Blaydes on the whole follows the lines laid down by the schools whose greatest representatives are those famous critics.

This book of course presents the well-known features of Mr. Blaydes' editions. In the critical notes he gives us a most laborious collation of MSS.—far fuller, if less systematic, than Von Velsen's. For this play Von Velsen used only four manuscripts: Mr. Blaydes often gives the readings of more than thirty on a single passage. Completeness in the control of such an enormous mass of minute material can hardly be looked for: we naturally find that Von Velsen's collation, as far as it goes, is the more careful. Mr. Blaydes gives no opinion on the merits or the interconnection of his MSS.: *R*, the recognised authority since Invernizzi worked on it (*illotis manibus* as Cobet says) is simply classed with all the rest from *V* to the poorest. The collations given will supply valuable and indeed indispensable material for conclusions as to the kinship of the MSS. of Aristophanes such as Schnee and Bamberg have already given.

On the merits of Mr. Blaydes' conjectures opinions will be divided as usual. His critics have agreed only in attributing to him in this respect the one quality of a certain gaiety of heart—not a sufficient, and hardly even a necessary, condition of success. The very number (perhaps a little smaller than of old) and variety of his proposals on many single passages make it hard to take them quite seriously, and really imply the negation of a critical method of conjecture: surely the supporters of such a procedure can never be in the majority. It seems the superfluity of wantonness to make such conjectures as *χῆσεν* for *χῆσειν* in 263 (was *χῆσμαι* ever used in good Attic?), *καὶ μὴν ὁρῶ γε Βλεψίδημον* in 332 (it is exactly in cases where *καὶ μὴν* introduces a new character that *γε* cannot follow), *παύσαι* in 505 (after Rutherford's discussion of such optatives), *ἤλκεν* in 681 (an obvious and commonplace word for the witty *ἤγχευ*). It is all the more surprising after this to find Mr. Blaydes giving the MS. reading where it is surely wrong, as in 368. And in the chief *cruxes* of the play, such as 119 and 885, it cannot be said that Mr. Blaydes has done much towards a solution. The critical notes were printed seven years ago: this explains the fact that we have 32 pages of 'Addenda et Corrigenda' at the end of the volume.

In the exegetical Commentary Mr. Blaydes prints the scholia in full, without much attempt to graduate their importance or disengage their meaning when it is obscure (in the September number, 1887, of the *Review* Dr. Rutherford has given a specimen which shows both the difficulty and the importance of such a work). He prints also the notes of Bergler—nearly always sensible and short, as well as most of Bakhuizen's remarks on the lines containing parodies: it would be difficult to treat those lines better. Mr.

Blaydes' own notes are generally full and excellent. In especial he gives us here, as in former plays, most valuable collections of parallel passages illustrative of usage. Such are his notes on 314, 322, 402, 470, 486, 546, 785: these can only be received with much respect and gratitude. The chief fault that can be found with this part of the work is a neglect of more recent work done by other scholars, and in the lines of scholarship other than the purely verbal. On points of Attic orthography, it is a little irritating to be referred merely to Elmsley and Lobeck and the old generations, while the evidence of epigraphy is entirely overlooked. On such good old questions as the augment of verbs beginning with *εἰ*—no account is taken even of Rutherford's *New Phrynicus*. Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* is three years old (a second edition has just appeared): and a glance at it settles once for all many points that Elmsley and Lobeck could only discuss with erudite indecision.

Again we miss in Mr. Blaydes' work an appreciation of the more refined points of Attic style. There is no mention of the difference between *ἀκολουθεῖν* or *ἔσονται* with the dative and with *μετὰ τινος*, of the *ἐν* in threats as in 64, of the 'pathetic' use of *διὰ χρόνου* ('for old times') as in 1055. On 114 we have a marvellous collection of cases parallel to the repetition *οἷμαι γὰρ, οἷμαι*, but the note on *ὅν θεοῖς* ought to contain a reference to Tycho Mommsen's investigations on the use of *ὅν*: these results are at last made accessible and we may perhaps hope to see them noticed even in English editions.

A Porsonian is apt to interest himself in verbal scholarship to the neglect of *realia*: and we ought to have more information than Mr. Blaydes gives us on such passages as 277 (where Dindorf's mention of the find of three dicasts' tickets in Attic tombs should be supplemented at all events by a reference to Hicks' *Inscriptions* p. 202), 408 (on state-paid physicians), 733 (where only Bergler's note is given on the snakes of Aesculapius), 1132 (the mixed libation to Hermes).

The *Plutus* offers a tempting opportunity for a treatment of the purely literary questions arising out of it. The development of the story before and since Aristophanes must be full of interest. The change from the *Equites* to the *Plutus* in spirit and language is really comparable to the change from Rabelais to Montaigne, or from *Twelfth Night* to the *Way of the World*. This is merely hinted at in Ritter's dissertation on the date of our version of the play (reprinted here from Dindorf's abridgment). But a satisfactory treatment of such points is probably impossible in Latin notes: criticism has advanced with literary performance, and it is too far a cry from Quintilian to Coleridge. Mr. Blaydes belongs to a school of critics who preferred to leave such questions implicit, and to let each reader work his own salvation in such matters: and his edition is not likely to be used by any who have not already come to conclusions for themselves.

THE 170 pages of Mr. Blaydes' *Acharnians* of 1845 have grown to 500 in the edition of 1887: the fifteen pages of 'Addenda et Corrigenda' in the old edition have been incorporated in the body of the new, and are replaced now by sixty pages of new 'Addenda et Corrigenda.' The editor says he has spent more time and work on this play than on any other: 'scatet enim, plus fortasse quam reliquae, corruptelis plurimis ac gravissimis quas pro virili parte emendare studui.' His proposals to amend those corruptions will not carry conviction to the ordinary mind. Favourable specimens of them are *τούσδε ξερίζειν* in 170 and *ἀλλὰ μὴν κἀκείνος ἦν* in 428.

But for the most part in Mr. Blaydes' case, as indeed in Von Velsen's, a most valuable collection of materials to form a text has not been supplemented or controlled by a sound judgment. In 823 the quotations given support a reading which Mr. Blaydes rejects: in 869 a conjecture of ἀντιφῆαν is supported by the statement, 'ab antiquo verbo *Flux* unde Latina ico, ictus, jacio. Hesych. *Flḗar* χερῆσαι', where the plain gloss of Hesychius might surely have saved us the heresy of *Flux* jacio: in 879 who will make a selection out of the menagerie set before us in the critical note? Mr. Blaydes aims laudably at completeness even at the risk of being superfluous: but on several occasions he fails to give a reference to important authorities which might have saved much trouble. On 318 we have a critical note a page long full of conjectures (three or four more are thrown out in the Addenda); but no mention is made of Wilamowitz' confident defence of the MS. reading (*Isyllos von Epidauros* p. 8). On 541-2 no notice is taken of Dr. Reid's explanation of the MS. reading (given in Merry's edition). On 1093 Prof. Tyrrell's brilliant conjecture ἐς τὸ φίλτατ' Ἀρμύδι' ὅς is ignored. Would Mr. Blaydes have written on 722 'vulgata solecca est' if he had quoted Shilleto on Thueyd. ii. 24, 21?

We have always to thank Mr. Blaydes for most extensive collections of parallel passages, and in this volume these collections are more numerous and more full than ever: witness those given on 396, 421, 533 (critical note), 753, 1146, and many other lines. Perhaps we hardly ought to complain that these collections are sometimes given both in the critical notes and again in the commentary, as on 150, 234, 475, 850.

We may regret that Mr. Blaydes has failed to grasp and to illustrate such things as the σοφῶς in 401, the ἀνρ both of praise and blame in 707, the exact force of πρὸς ταῦτα as in 659 (Cobet, *novae lect.* p. 271): we miss any reference to the historical difficulties raised by Müller-Strübing on 590 foll. and the mass of recent literature on this passage: and we might expect some notice to be taken of Zielinski's views on the construction of Comedy.

But with all drawbacks Mr. Blaydes' edition of Aristophanes will remain a monument of wide knowledge and wonderful labour. It is satisfactory to see that the *Frogs* has appeared, and that the *Clouds* is in the press.

R. A. NEIL.

The Suppliant Women of Euripides. A revised Text with brief English Notes, for the use of Schools. By F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge. Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1s. 6d.

THIS edition is furnished with a useful historical introduction and helpful explanatory notes, and thus makes it more possible than it was before to add to the list of plays read in schools one which, as Mr. Paley says, contains 'some splendid passages,' and 'has a direct reference to events of the period.' As regards the constitution of the text, all students of Euripides must be grateful to Dr. Paley for every fresh expression of his judgment, whether he is deciding between the views of earlier editors or making fresh suggestions of his own. Of the latter this edition contains sixty. It is however surprising, that in an edition in which more than half the notes deal with critical questions no reference is made to the latest published collation of the MSS. of the play—that, viz. in the critical edition of von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*Analecta Euripidea*, pp.

79 ff.); and also that the letters used by Kirchhoff to designate the Palatine and the Laurentian MSS. are wrongly printed as B and C at p. 6 of the Introduction and wherever else they occur.

In the metrical discussion on 1196 it is difficult to see how the sounding of *ia* 'as *yah*' would produce the requisite long syllable. There is an inconsistency too between the Introduction, p. 12, l. 7, where the Chorus is spoken of as the *widows* of the fallen chiefs, and the notes on 42, 100, 940, 944 and 949, where they are spoken of as their mothers.

E. B. ENGLAND.

Polybii Historiae. F. HULTSCH. 2nd Ed. Vol. I. Berlin: Weidmann. 4 Mk. 50.

AFTER an interval of twenty years since the commencement of his first edition, Hultsch has given to the world the first volume of a second edition of the *Historiae* of Polybius. His labours have been mainly devoted to the establishment of a sound text, and he enters on questions of interpretation only incidentally. As a monument of textual learning the book is worthy of the place it now holds, as the standard edition of Polybius. Hultsch has mainly based this part of his work on a careful study of the Vatican MS. of Books I.—V., the pre-eminent authority of which he fully establishes. He gives however at the foot of each page an elaborate *apparatus criticus*, including not only all deviations of any importance in the MS. authority, but the history of the attempts towards amending the text which have been made by modern scholars from Casaubon downwards. A critic 'were as good go a mile on his errand' as dare to approach Hultsch with an emendation which is already in his notebook. He visits on the head of the unconscious plagiarist all the annoyance which he feels—'taedium illud molestissimum, quod tanquam in cibus coctis recoquendis, ita in conjecturis lectis iterum iterumque legendis non sine suspiriis percepi.' The scholars who contribute to the Dutch *Mnemosyne* come in for the largest share of his wrath, and certainly in some of the instances he quotes we cannot but feel that he does well to be angry.

While all students of Polybius owe a debt of gratitude to Hultsch for his labours on the text, it is very doubtful whether they have reason to bless him for the re-arrangement of the fragments and the consequent change in the notation. Hitherto the order adopted by Schweighäuser at the beginning of the century has been universally accepted. His books and chapters have been taken as the basis of notation, and the extracts discovered since his time have been inserted as supplemental chapters (1a, 1b, &c.), each in its supposed place. All this traditional order is now swept away. The change makes no difference in Books I.—V., but in the later volumes consisting of fragments and excerpts great confusion is caused. Hultsch gave us indeed even in the first edition a reference at the head of each chapter to the corresponding notation of Bekker, and in this edition he inserts a further reference to Bekker's pages. Any one reading Polybius in Hultsch's edition will have no difficulty in finding the corresponding passage in Bekker or Schweighäuser. But this is not the want for which it is most necessary to provide. What we really require is a facility for the reverse process. Many students will wish to read Polybius and to read it in the best text, without burdening themselves with the bulky volumes of Schweighäuser's text, translation, and notes. These may be reserved for occasional use in a library. But Schweighäuser's Lexicon is a help with which no one can dispense

who seriously desires to get at a correct interpretation of the Greek. This splendid work remains after eighty years by far the most valuable contribution to the study of Polybius. The meaning of each word, as it is employed by our author, is developed by judicious analysis and by reference to all the important passages; the reader ought to be continually turning to these passages to see the context and to weigh for himself the effect of each. But if he has only Hultsch's edition at hand he may hunt in vain. It is doubtful whether for practical service he will not do better to content himself with the less perfect text but more convenient arrangement of Bekker. It would be a magnificent compensation to his readers, if Hultsch would re-publish the Lexicon of Schweighäuser, supplementing it by elucidations from the newly-discovered fragments, and altering the references to suit the new notation. Till this is done, those who use his work are placed at a serious disadvantage.

The doctrine that Polybius dislikes and avoids the hiatus between two vowels has been established mainly by the sagacity and industry of Hultsch, who as early as 1859 discussed the matter in the 14th vol. of *Philologus*. There are admitted exceptions, as when the hiatus coincides with a pause in the sense, or when it occurs between the article and the substantive, and in a few other such cases. Perhaps Hultsch hardly allows enough for the possibility of exceptions outside the limits which he acknowledges. It is not unnatural that the discoverer should be disposed to insist somewhat too rigidly on a rule, which our author undoubtedly had generally before him. It would however be a surprising thing if in the course of forty books a writer so careless of style as Polybius should never have made a slip. I cannot think that when all the MSS. are agreed we are justified in altering the text to make it suit this requirement. In one passage in this volume (Polyb. iii. 81, 10), where the art of war is said to consist in seizing on the weak points of your adversary—*ἡ μάλιστα καὶ δι' ὧν εὐχεύμενος ἔσται | ὁ πρὸς τὰς τῶν πολεμίων*—Hultsch so far acknowledges this as to retain the hiatus in his text, though in the Preface (p. lxxv.) he gives his own conjecture and those of others as to an alteration. To my mind he has exercised on this occasion a sound discretion in not admitting any of the emendations proposed into his text, and I cannot see any reason to doubt the soundness of the MS. reading. In the present edition Hultsch has introduced the innovation of getting rid of the hiatus whenever it is possible to evade it by elision or crasis, even in passages where the MSS. give no hint of such a thing. This of course is a much less serious change than an actual alteration of the text; still there are passages where this device seems somewhat to mar the dignity and beauty of a sentence.

It is a great improvement in this edition that the most important questions in textual criticism, which arise in the course of the volume, are collected together and discussed in the Preface, a reference to each such discussion being given at the foot of the page, where the passage occurs in the text. I will briefly notice one or two of the most interesting points.

On Polyb. ii. 39, 6, Hultsch expresses his disagreement with the liberty which I have taken in my *Selections from Polybius* of altering the *Διὸς Ὀυραίου* of the Vatican MS. into *Ἀμυρίου* on the strength of the inscription of Orchomenos, recorded by Foucart in vol. xxxii. of the *Révue Archéologique*. The title of the tutelary deity of the Achaean League, or of his temple (Polyb. v. 93, 10) at Aegium, is given not

only in Polybius, but likewise in Pausanias and Strabo. In Polybius the only variant is *Ὀυραίου* in one of the passages according to a later MS., but in the other writers the name reads *Ἀράριος*, *Ἀνάρριος*, or *Ὀμαγύριος*. I do not understand Hultsch to question the identity of the deity in all these cases. If this be admitted, we have the result that the MS. authority for his precise title is conflicting and, notwithstanding the weight of Hultsch's dissent, I still agree with Foucart that we are bound to accept the testimony of a contemporary inscription for the correct form of the word.

In Polyb. iii. 58, 9 the MSS. read *καταφρονήσαντα τῆς παραδοξολογίας καὶ τερατείας αὐτοῦ χάριν προτιμήσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ μὴδὲν τῶν παρὲς ὄντων ἡμῖν ἀναγγεῖλαι*. Schweighäuser suggests at the foot of the page '*αὐτῆς utique videtur legendum*,' and translates '*ipsam propter se veritatem colat*.' From his remark in the Lexicon (s.v. *αὐτοῦ*) Schweighäuser seems at a later period to have formed the opinion that the MS. reading, as it stands, might bear the same sense—'*αὐτοῦ* in feminino genere aut pro eo positum: *αὐτοῦ χάριν προτιμήσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, veritatem propter se (propter ipsam) colere.' Hultsch, though he does not seem to have noticed (any more than I did until it was pointed out to me by the editor of this Review) the passage in Schweighäuser's Lexicon, hits on the same device of keeping the reading *αὐτοῦ* and giving it the sense of *αὐτῆς*. He says, '*si αὐτῆς scriptor posuisset, haec forma a legentibus ad παραδοξολογίας καὶ τερατείας relata esset: quam ambiguitatem ut evitaret κατὰ σύνεσιν neutrum αὐτοῦ protulit, quasi τὸ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγειν sequeretur*.' The explanation '*ipsam propter se veritatem colere*' comes before us with much greater force, now that we are not required to alter the MS. reading in order to get at it. In my own note on the passage I did not think it worth while to notice Schweighäuser's translation, believing, as I then did, that it was bound up with his supposed emendation. That translation must now certainly be admitted as a possible rendering, perhaps as the most probable rendering of the text. Reiske's interpretation however, which I formerly followed, still seems to me to be by no means out of court—'*spretā vanitate in comminiscendis et venditandis fabulis mirificis et prodigiosis sese jactante, quā id quaerunt illi nugatores ut non paullo plus illi quam alii sapere et praestare viderentur, veritatem omnibus rebus unam praeferre*.' Hultsch's comment on Reiske is as follows—'*quae cum scripserit, in ταυτολογία quandam delapsus esse videtur vir alioquin subtilissimus*.' I would reply that the verbosity of Reiske's rendering perhaps deserves rebuke, but that the sense, which it somewhat clumsily conveys, may be expressed without the slightest tautology, 'to pay regard to truth above all things, scorning to indulge for the sake of self-glorification (*αὐτοῦ χάριν*) in startling and marvellous assertions.'

Polybius' account (iii. 117, 3) of the number of prisoners at Cannae is a puzzle for commentators. It reads—*ἐκ δὲ τῶν πλεόντων μαχόμενοι μὲν ἐλάωσαν εἰς μυριάδας, οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν ὄντων τῆς μάχης*. Hultsch remarks with reason—'*Intacta haec verba plerique editores reliquerunt, non quod ea sana atque integra esse senserunt, sed, opinor, quia nihil aliud quod satis probabile esse videretur, erat in promptu*.' I have attempted (*Selections*, ch. 90) to construe it, following Schweighäuser, 'these, though captured, were not in the battle,' adding that 'the expression is awkward,' a phrase perhaps hardly as forcible as the occasion demanded. It is difficult to contend (as we must if this interpretation is to be maintained) that the *οἱ δὲ* refers to the same persons as *μαχόμενοι μὲν*,

or that *μαχόμενοι μὲν ἐκτὸς δ' ὄντες τῆς μάχης* means 'fighting, it is true, but not on the battle-field,' or that *εἰς μυρίους* is only a loose way of putting the 8,000, which, as we are told a few lines on, was really the number of those captured at the camp, or again that Polybius did not acknowledge a single prisoner taken on the field of battle. Hultsch (p. lxxi.) suggests (though he does not admit it into his text) an emendation which makes excellent sense and avoids all these difficulties. He proposes to read *μαχόμενοι μὲν ἐδλωσαν εἰς χιλίους, δετακισχίλιοι δ' ἐκτὸς ὄντες τῆς μάχης*. This gives 1,000 + 8,000, + 3,000 + about 70,000 = about 82,000, which does not diverge intolerably from the rough total of 'about 80,000' mentioned in ch. 113, 5. Hultsch tries to account for the wide discrepancy between his reading and that of the MS. by the supposition that the numbers were in some archetypal copy expressed not in words but in numerical letters. He thinks that Polybius' words, as he has reconstructed them, might in some ancient MS. have been written ΕΙC Α ΗΟΙ

ΔΕΚΤΟC, and that this again might have been easily corrupted into ΕΙCΑΘΟΙΔΕΚΤΟC.

At this stage the symbols ΕΙCΑΘ would, according to Hultsch, have the interpretation of *εἰς μίαν μυριάδα*, which a subsequent scribe would readily alter into the more Polybian phrase *εἰς μυρίους*. The palaeographical part of the argument depends on two suppositions, first that ΑΘ can stand for *μῆν μυριάδα*, and secondly that while *χιλίους* was written simply Α, *δετακισχίλιοι* might be written not Η but ΗΟΙ. Both these propositions seem very questionable, especially the second. I am not aware what may be Hultsch's grounds for believing that the inflexional case-termination can be inserted after the numeral letter in the case of a cardinal number. Hultsch himself gives us no assistance. All that can be said is that if he has no authority for such a mode of writing he is seriously misleading his readers, and that if he has authorities and thinks it not worth while to state them, he greatly over-estimates the palaeographical knowledge likely to be found among those who use his book. Till this point is cleared up it is difficult to form a conclusion as to the soundness of the emendation. Sound or not, it is certainly most tempting, as restoring at once construction, consistency, and completeness to a sentence which, as it appears in the MSS., seems to be largely wanting in all these qualities.

J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON.

Lucian's Dialogues, namely the Dialogues of the Gods, of the Sea-Gods, and of the Dead; Zeus the Tragedian, the Ferry-Boat etc., translated with notes and a preliminary memoir by HOWARD WILLIAMS, M.A. Bohn's Classical Series, 1888. Pp. xxv, 315. 5s.

THIS translation may fairly be described as good of its kind. It is a generally accurate *construe* of the original. More than a construe it does not profess to be. Graces of style are deliberately sacrificed by the translator, who considers them incompatible with his chief aim. Thus a version is produced which subordinates the higher to the lower fidelity, and cannot be regarded as reflecting the spirit of Lucian or as a serious attempt to render him attractive to English readers. At the same time the translation is, as already said, trustworthy in the main, though we are sometimes startled with such a rendering as that on p. 176, 'and that (gold) is more precious than all

the other metals put together,' *οὗτος δὲ ὅλοις μετάλλοις πλουσιώτερός ἐστιν*. It should be mentioned that considerable pains have been taken with the notes and the index, the latter of which covers 30 pages. The following may be given as an average specimen of the translation. Subjoined for comparison is a somewhat free rendering of the same passage by Froude (*Short Studies*, vol. iii. p. 329). 'Well, admirable Sir, all persons will concede to you that Homer was a good poet, but not that, of such matters, either he or any other poet is a trustworthy witness. For they care not for truth, I imagine, but for enchanting their hearers, and, therefore, they charm them by their verses and instruct them by their fables, and, in fine, use every device with a view to delighting' (p. 198). Froude's rendering is: 'My excellent friend, Homer may be a first-rate poet, but neither he nor any of his kind are authorities on matters of fact. The object of poetry is to amuse, not to instruct. Poets arrange their words in metre, they invent legends out of their imagination, they desire to give their hearers pleasure, and that is all.' Wieland's much-praised version here gives us: 'Mein bewundernswürdiger Herr, dass Homerein guter Dichtergewesen sey, wird dir jedermann gerne zugeben; aber niemand, dass er oder irgend ein anderer Dichter als ein Zeuge der Wahrheit in Sachen dieser Art aufgestellt werden könne. Ich denke nicht dass es ihnen am Wahrheit zu thun sey; ihre Absicht ist die Zuhörer zu ergötzen und zu bezaubern: desswegen singen sie in Versen, desswegen sind ihre Werke mit Fabeln und Dichtungen angefüllt, und kurz, desswegen ist bey ihnen Alles auf das Angenehme angelegt.'

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria, von HANS VON ARNIM, Berlin. Weidmann. 1888. 8vo. pp. 140. 4 Marks.

THIS volume of the *Philologische Untersuchungen* will be found interesting rather as a contribution to the history of Greek philosophy, than from the special point of view of the student of Philo. It consists of three discussions:—i. über die pseudophilonische Schrift *περί ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*. ii. Philo und Aenesidem. iii. ein stoisches Zetema bei Philo. In the first von Arnim takes his start from the unfinished commentary of Bernays, and proceeds to investigate the approximate date, the purpose and the sources of the treatise *περί ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*, in regard to which he arrives at the following results. It was written about the latter half of the first century B.C. by one of those eclectic philosophers who endeavoured to harmonise the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, and exhibits that tendency to mysticism which is characteristic of the Alexandrines. The author made use of various Peripatetic and Stoic documents. His work is a mere compilation, and the points at issue between the two schools are not very clearly grasped. The second deals with a passage of the *περί μέθης* (i. 383—388), where Philo is insisting upon the deceptive character of all sense knowledge. The argument is borrowed from a Greek philosopher, and this must be Aenesidemus, for we find here the *τρόποι τῆς ἐποχῆς*, which Sextus gives in a very similar shape, and distinctly ascribes to the great Sceptic. Von Arnim supports his position by investigations into the date of Aenesidemus (whom he holds to have flourished in the time of Cicero, and not, as Zeller thought, in the Augustan age), and into the relation of Aenesidemus to Heraclitus. The third takes for its text *de plantatione Noe* (i. 350—358). The passage is 'a chapter from a collection of *ἠθικά ζητήματα* composed for general readers by an

eclectic Stoic of the most liberal school, after Posidonius and Antiochus, but probably before the birth of Christ.' The most important part of Von Arnim's work will be found in the second of his chapters which forms an appreciable addition to our knowledge of the dim but interesting figure of the Sceptic Philosopher. But from the nature of the case the discussion though conducted with much learning and ingenuity can only lead to somewhat shadowy results.

C. BIGG.

Quaestiones Epictetæ. R. ASMUS. Pp. 1-51. Berlin: Freiburg, 1888.

THE writer, shows (1) that many of the fragments assigned to Epictetus in the standard editions are either doubtful or may be certainly assigned to other authors; (2) that Epictetus wrote nothing himself, and that we have no reason to suppose that Arrian wrote any other treatise on the subject of Epictetus beyond the two which we now possess.

Pythagoras in India. H. H. HOWORTH. Pp. 1-25. 1887.

MR. HOWORTH here puts into popular form the arguments by which Schroeder endeavours to prove that the origin of the Pythagorean philosophy in Greece was due to the same impulse which gave birth to Buddhism in India. He has certainly succeeded in showing that there is a remarkable similarity between doctrines or practices attributed to Pythagoras and the teaching of the Indian sacred books.

Commentationes Philologæ in honorem Sodalitii philologorum Gryphiswaldensis secundum lustrum a. d. iv. Kal. Aug. a. 1887 conditis. Scripserunt veteres Sodales. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 1. 60.

OF the six papers which compose this little publication of sixty-seven pages, five are concerned with investigating sources. A. Brunk attempts to establish the existence of a collection of anecdotes which Aelian in his *Varia historia* and the author of the collection of apophthegmata, attributed to Plutarch, made use of independently, and he would identify such a collection with τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα or τὰ ἀποφθέγματα to which Plutarch himself sometimes refers. Waldemar Olsen makes it probable that Propertius influenced Tibullus and not *vice versa*. G. Knaack in a paper 'De fabulis nonnullis Cyzicenis' compares the account of Conon who derived his information from Ephoros, with that of Apollonios Rhodios who followed Deilochos, in regard to the Argonauts at Cyzicus. P. Rasch investigates how far Pliny made use of Hyginus' treatise on bees, and M. Wellmann determines the extent to which Apollodoros in his *Bibliotheca* adopted statements of Hellanicus. The only paper that is not a study in sources is by G. Schulze on πολὺς and ὀδὸς in Homer. For πολὺς which occurs eighteen times as a dissyllable he would read πολὺς (= πολύν), just as Christ reads πελέκυσ for πελέκας in four places in Ψ. To explain the shortening of the first syllable of ὀδὸς or ὀδ in several passages in Homer, he has recourse to a primary form ὀδς (= οὐδᾶς*), cf. Sk. sñus, Germ. sñus, from which he derives all the forms in use by an elaborate process of contamination.

JOHN B. BURY.

Leptodendron Septentrionale. By L. CAMPBELL. Edinburgh.

THIS charming little book deserves a warm welcome from scholars. Prof. Campbell has shown himself a

master of many styles of Greek verse, and if less successful in Epic and Elegiac than in Tragic metres, there is much of every kind which challenges untinted praise.

Two Homeric fragments much amplified in translation, perhaps too much, open the volume. Gray's *Elegy* is one of the toughest morsels for the translator and has been most vigorously assailed, with what success such lines as these will show:

χλωραῖς δ' ἐν βήσσησιν ἀνίνδυνον τε κατ' ὁμον
ἄσφοδον ἐξετέλεον ἀτραπιτῶν βιοτῆς.

Here is a good couplet from another quarter:

Affliction follows Fortune's wheels,
And soon is shaken from her heels.

ὅκα τύχης κύκλοις ἔπεται πόθος, ὅκα δ' ἀπορραῖ
κλινθέντων ὀχέον λὰς ἀποκρουόμενος.

The Iambics which follow, translations from Shakspeare for the most part, are in the Aeschylean strain, more so perhaps than might have been expected from a commentator on Sophocles. But neither is this tone absent, and two beautiful epigrams in honour of the 'sweet singer of Colonus' are to be found in the book.

The well-known lines of the Chorus in *Henry V.* describing the preparations for war are nobly rendered. What again can be more dexterous than the way in which tennis-court phrases are handled in the tennis-court scene from the same play.

When we have matched our rackets to these balls,
We will, in France, by God's grace, play a set
Shall strike his father's crown into the hazard.
Tell him he hath made his match with such a
wrangler
That all the courts of France will be disturbed
With chaces.

σφαίραις σπάθην δὲ ταῖσδ' ἐπαρτύσας ἐγὼ
σφαίρισμ' ἐκέισ' ἂν σὺν θεῷ παίζοιμ', ὅπερ
κείνου πατὴρον κύκλον εἰς ἔρκος βαλεῖ.
τοῖφδε γάρ τοι τῆσδε παιδίας ἔην
ἀντιστατῇ ἐνῆψεν, ὥστ' ἀλλας ἐκεῖ
χώραν θ' ἄπασαν, ὥς δέμον σφαιριστικὴν,
κτυπεῖν κροτητοῖς Ἀπῖαν δραμήμασιν.

The scene in the Forum over Caesar's body, with the speeches of Brutus and Antony, is given at length, and though unequal contains much admirable work.

Choric fragments most melodious in tone and happy in expression are interspersed in the volume.

The only criticisms which occur are minute: κλῦθι should perhaps be confined to Choric metres; κατὰ βα, κάτω βῆθ' with its suggestion of Aristophanes contrasts significantly the true Attic form with the Epic; and against ζῆθι we must enter a protest; the form βιοῦσι which occurs in Hamlet's soliloquy, 'To be or not to be,' is of doubtful authority; and in the last line of the great passage in the *Tempest*—

ἴω, βρότεια πράγμαθ', ὡς ὀνειράτων
ἀλίγκιοι μορφαῖσι, τὸν βραχὺν βίον
τελοῦντες οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν κοίτης ἔπο
σμικρὸν χρόνον βλέψαντες αὐ κοιμώμεθα—

surely αἶ is incorrect, and we should read either αἰθῆς εὐδομεν or εὐδομεν πάλιν.

Greek Elegiacs are free from dialectic rules, and avowedly follow on the lines of late authors: but ἐπίων in page 15 should have been plainly written ἐπῶν, as it is an Iambic in scansion.

E. D. S.

NOTES.

HIDE-MEASURED LANDS.—Every one knows how Dido bought as much land as could be covered by an oxhide and then cutting the hide in strips surrounded with them the site whereon she built her city which thence received the name of Byrsa (Virgil, *Aeneid* i. 367 sq.; Justin xviii. 5). Similar stories are cited by Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 90 sq. and R. Köhler, in *Orient und Occident*, iii. p. 185 sqq. To the parallels adduced by them I would add the following.

(1) In a Tartar story, Jermak begs a chief to give him land to the extent of a hide. The chief grants his request. Then Jermak cuts the hide into narrow strips, fastens a pole in the ground, and tying one end of the thong to the pole traces a circle, of which the full length of the thong is the radius. He then takes possession of the land included in this circle and dwells there. W. Radloff, *Proben der Volksliteratur der Türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibirien*, iv. p. 179.

(2) In a Burmese legend King Dwattabong had a favourite female slave who asked for as much land as she could cover with a hide. The king granted her request; whereupon she cut the hide in strips and with them surrounded land enough whereon to build the city of Issay-Mew. The name of the whole kingdom, Thara-Kettara or Thayakittaya, is derived by the Burmese from Thara or Thá-ya, 'a hide'. A. Bastian, *Die Völker des östlichen Asien*, i. p. 25.

(3) In Cambodia Bastian was told that hundreds of years ago the Dutch came in great ships and asked from the king as much land as they could cover with a buffalo's hide. On getting his leave they cut the hide in strips and enclosed a wide space, on which they meant to build a stronghold.—Bastian, *op. cit.*, iv. p. 367 sq.

(4) Javanese historians tell how a Dutch captain sunk his ship off Jakatra and then requested of the prince of the place a small piece of ground on which he might build a shed to store the sails &c. while he tried to raise the ship. This request was granted. 'He afterwards waited on the prince, and requested as much more land as could be covered by a buffalo's hide, on which he might build a small *péndok*. This being complied with, he cut the hide into strips, and claimed all the land he could inclose with them. To this also the prince, after some hesitation, consented'. Raffles, *History of Java*, ii. p. 153 sq. (ed. 1817).

(5) According to a Balinese legend, the people of Tenganan, a district in Bali, formerly enjoyed the honour of keeping the herds of the King of Kaloengkoeng. It befel that the King's riding horse died at pasture. So the King commanded that the horse should be buried on the spot and that the land, as far as the smell of the carrion spread, should belong to the herdsman. Thereupon the people of Tenganan cut the carcass in pieces and each of them sticking a bit in his girdle set off to walk. They walked and walked till they had as much land as they knew what to do with; and that is why the district of Tenganan is one of the biggest in Bali. Van Eck, 'Schetsen van het eiland Bali', in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, February, 1880, p. 117.

Strictly speaking in the last example the standard of measurement is not the hide but the walking power of the people of Tenganan. But the similarity to the other stories will not be denied. The wide diffusion of such tales confirms Grimm's conjecture (*DA.* p.

538 sq.) that in them we have a recollection of a mode of land measurement once actually in use and of which the designation is still retained in the English *hide*.

J. G. FRAZER.

* *

THE BEDSTEAD OF THE FLAMEN DIALIS.—In the curious chapter of Aulus Gellius (x. 15) which details the minute rules observed by the Flamen Dialis in his daily life, it is said the feet of his bed had always to be smeared with fine mud. The meaning of this rule becomes plain when we remember that the *Σελλοί*, the old priests of Zeus at Dodona, were bound to sleep on the ground (*χαμαίειναι*, *Iliad* ii. 235), and further when we find that the priest of the old Prussian god Potrimpo was bound to sleep on the bare earth for three nights before he sacrificed to the god (Hartknoch, *Dissertationes historicae de variis rebus Prussicis*, p. 163, bound up with his edition of Düsburg's *Chronicon Prussiac*, Frankfurt and Leipzig 1679; Simon Grunau, *Preussischer Chronik*, ed. Perlbach, i. p. 95). Plainly the mud on the feet of the Flamen's bedstead was one of those 'accommodations with heaven' which are to be found in every religion. Instead of sleeping on the ground, as his predecessors doubtless did in days of old, the modern Flamen slept in a bed, but soothed his conscience by daubing the legs of the bed with mud and thus, by a convenient ecclesiastical fiction, sleeping on the ground. A chapter on ecclesiastical fictions would be agreeable and instructive reading. The ancient Jew rent his garments in mourning; the modern Jew (who knows the value of clothes, even of old ones) contents himself with undoing a seam for a couple of inches or so. In the second volume of Bastian's *Die Völker des östlichen Asien*, p. 319 sq. there is a pleasant description of the way in which a Burmese monk contrives to make the best of both worlds. He may not touch a woman—but if his mother falls into a well, he may pull her out with a long pole, provided he imagines that he is pulling out a log of wood. He may not eat after noon—but he is free at any time of the afternoon or evening to ask a disciple what o'clock it is, and if the disciple says 'Not noon yet' the monk may fall to. And so on *ad infinitum*.

J. G. FRAZER.

* *

ON μή PROHIBITIVE WITH FUTURE INDICATIVE.

Demosth. *Aristocr.* § 117: ταύτην, ἂν ἐμοὶ χρήσθε συμβούλῃ, φυλάξετε τὴν πίστιν πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν Θράκα καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι τίνα ἀν...πρὸς ὅμῳ σχοίη γνῶμην.

Lysias, *Or.* 29 § 13 (Bekker 19): εἰάν δὲ ἐδ' φρονήτε, καὶ νυνὶ φανερόν...ποιήσετε... καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοῖς εἰδειν δώσετε.

THESE two passages are quoted by Professor Goodwin (*Moods and Tenses*, § 25, note 5) in support of the view that μή with fut. indic. sometimes expresses a prohibition. They are also commented upon by Professor Butcher in a notice of Weil's Demosthenes (*Classical Review*, Oct. 1887). Weil, like Prof. Goodwin, says 'ὡς βουλήσεσθε = μή βούλεσθε.' Prof. Butcher dis-

poses of Weil's instance from Aristophanes (*Plutus* 488), pointing out that *μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδόσετε μὴδὲν* is part of a relative clause; and of Soph. *Ajax* 572, where the future depends on a preceding *ὅπως* (Dindorf and others having gratuitously printed a full stop in the middle of the sentence, at *εἰσαεῖ*); also of Menander *Mon.* 572 (reading not *ἀδικήσεις* but *ἀδικήσης*); and Eur. *Med.* 822 (reading not *λέξεις* but *λέξης*).

Prof. Goodwin has another example (qualified however by 'perhaps') Aesch. *Sept.* 250. But the whole line is *οὐ σίγα μὴδὲν τῶνδ' ἔρεῖς κατὰ πόλιν*; though some print *οὐ σίγα*; *μὴδὲν... πόλιν*. Prof. Butcher concludes: 'Comparing the two sentences' (in Demosthenes and Lysias), 'we may perhaps be driven to accept the usage, however rare, as genuine, and to give it a place beside certain other eccentric but well-established combinations.' I suggest the following explanation.

The expression *φυλάξετε καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε* is like the English 'you will take-care-and-not-wish.' 'You will take care and you will not wish' would be *φυλάξετε καὶ οὐ βουλήσεσθε*. Here there are two expressions, one affirmative and the other negative. But in *φυλάξετε καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε* ('you will take-care-and-not-wish') the negative expression is regarded as part of the affirmative. This of course is irregular; but, like so many irregularities, it is instructive, for it involves a principle.

I hold that *οὐ* is a special negative for a special purpose, being used categorically for negative assertions. Consequently *μὴ*, which I suppose to be the original negative, has been limited in its use, and is employed where there is no negative assertion: which is much the same as saying (though I think it is a more accurate way of saying) that it has become for the most part mental or conceptual. I suppose that, theoretically, 'He is not beautiful' is *οὐ καλὸς ἐστί*, and 'He is not-beautiful (unbeautiful)' is *μὴ-καλὸς ἐστί*. It is obvious how this corresponds to the difference between *οἱ οὐ καλοὶ* and *οἱ μὴ καλοὶ (δύντες)*. The 'generic' expression, *οἱ μὴ καλοὶ*, means 'the unbeautiful,' the persons whoever they may be who answer to the mental negative conception of 'unloveliness': in other words, there is no negative assertion implied. But *οἱ οὐ καλοὶ* is 'the persons of whom I deny that they are beautiful': this is categorical: it does contain a negative assertion. It is not, however, idiomatic Greek to say *μὴ καλὸς ἐστί*. The usual Greek idiom prefers, or requires, that the negative should come to the lips (so to speak) when it can, when no indirectness or subordinateness of construction interferes: prefers that a man should say (both things being equally possible in themselves) not 'He is unbeautiful,' but 'He is not beautiful.' Still, exceptions to this are not rare. So (most noticeably) Thucyd. i. 118, *οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι... ἡσυχάζον... ὄντες μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μὴ ταχεῖς ἵεναι ἐς τοὺς πολέμους* ('being unready'); or Soph. *Philoct.* 79, *ἔξοδα καὶ φύσει σὲ μὴ πεφονκτα*; or Plato *Phaedr.* 264 B, *ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ εἴδοεν, ὡς μὴδὲν εἶδοτι, οὐκ ἀγεννῶς τὸ ἐπὶ δὲν εἰρησθαὶ τῷ γράφοντι* ('I did not appreciate his fine argument, being such a poor ignoramus as I am,' a *μὴδὲν-εἶδώς, τῶν μὴδὲν εἰδόντων τις*); or, even with a finite verb, *Phaedo* 106 D, *σχολῇ γὰρ ἢν τι ἄλλο φθορὰν μὴ δέχοιτο* ('Hardly would anything else be indestructible, *μὴ-φθορὰν-δεχόμενον*, if not this'). What are all these but extensions of the ordinary 'generic' expression with definite article or relative, such as are regular in later Greek, e.g. S. Matt. 7, 19, *τῶν δένδρων μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται* (where the *μὴ* is essentially the same as that, with an article, in v. 26, *πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τοὺτους καὶ μὴ ποιοῦν αὐτούς*)?

And again, *theoretically*, 'you will-not wish' (I deny that you will wish) is *οὐ βουλήσεσθε*; but 'you will not-wish' (I affirm that you will be indisposed) *μὴ βουλήσεσθε*. But here, as before, idiom requires us to use *οὐ*: the negative must come to the lips if it can: in other words, *μὴ* with indic. is only used where there is a reason for not using *οὐ*. For example, in a hypothesis, *εἰ μὴ βούλεσθε* (put the case of your not wishing): or in a 'generic' expression, as *ὅστις μὴ βούλεται* = *ὁ μὴ βουλόμενος*, where a distinct purpose is served (viz. the avoidance of assertion) by having an expression different from *ὅπερ οὐ βούλεται* = *ὁ οὐ βουλόμενος*. And so it is, though exceptionally, in the two passages under consideration. There is a reason for saying 'you will not-wish' (you will be indisposed), which is an *affirmatio negativi* and not a denial. And the reason is that the negative expression is regarded as part of the affirmative. It is so attached to *φυλάξετε* that it becomes a statement of what 'you' *will* do, not of what 'you' *will* not do. 'You *will* be indisposed.' 'You *will* take-care-and-not-wish.'

R. WHITELAW.

* * *

On *Iliad* II. 354-6:

*τῷ μὴ τις πρὶν ἐπειγέσθω οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι
πρὶν τινα παρ Τρωῶν ἀλόχῳ κατακοιμηθῆναι,
τίσασθαι δ' Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε.*

The dispute as to whether 'Ἑλένης' is a subjective or objective genitive—whether, that is, we are to take it (i.) with Ameis as 'Seelenleiden und Seufzer (Klagen) der Helena,' or (ii.) with Mr. Leaf as 'groans,' &c. for Helen'—has lasted considerably longer than the original quarrel about that lady. Now it cannot be subjective because, as Mr. Leaf says, 'Helen having deserted her husband voluntarily could not be regarded by the Greeks as a victim whose sufferings they were to avenge.' It cannot be objective because, as Ameis says, you cannot imagine 10,000 Greeks having such feelings as *ὀρμήματα* and *στοναχάς* for Helen. I quite agree with both. These two commentators having thus satisfactorily disposed of each other, the ground is clear for a third alternative, which seems so obvious that I think it must have occurred to others before; viz., to translate the passage, 'And make the Trojans pay for Helen the miseries of rapes and groans'; taking 'Ἑλένης' as the gen. of price *ἀντὶ* 'Ἑλένης, and *ὀρμήματα* and *στοναχάς* in the sense of 'violent assaults' and 'groans,' such as traditionally characterize the sack of a city; cf. Cornificius, *Neminem fugit urbe capta quae miseriae consequi solent... liberi partim jugulantur... partim constriuntur*. In this way we get a satisfactory connexion not only between the two words, but also with the previous line, which under the two other interpretations has never seemed to me satisfactory. That *ὀρμήματα* with such a context can mean this, I do not doubt: our only clue to its meaning is its connexion with *ὀρμή*, 'violent impulse or rush.' That *τίσασθαι* should be so used seems natural enough *à priori*; and the view is confirmed by the use of *ἀντιτίσασθαι*—cf. *ἀγωνῆς ἀντιτίσασθαι φόνον*, Aesch. *Agam.* 1263. Much of the brutality of the incentive held out in the second line is done away with when it figures as an appropriate form of revenge. The use of the singular *ἀλόχῳ* also becomes more intelligible, as contrasted with Menelaus' wife, whose rape each Greek is thus to avenge.

J. E. NIXON.

Pindar, *Pyth.* I. 1, *Χρυσά φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰσολοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισῶν κτείανον*. Dr. Fennell, after Heyne and Cookesley, explains *σύνδικον* 'that takest part with,' i.e. as aiding or backing the celestial singers, which gives far better sense than the usual and insipid interpretation, 'common treasure of.' I observe that Mr. Sidgwick in his edition of the *Agamemnon* gives this same sense to the adverb *συνδίκως* in the difficult line (1601) *λάκτισμα δειπνῶν συνδίκως τιθεὶς ἄρ'α*, the overturning of the table being conceived of as aiding and backing up the curse. This makes it unnecessary to read *ἄρ'α* with Herm. and Pal. who even then give a very far-fetched interpretation. The two passages might with advantage be compared in this sense, and not in that in which L. and S. bring them together.

In *Classical Review*, 280 a, Prof. Tucker (after Cobet) notices the frequent MSS. confusion between *αὐτός* and *ἀσπός*. Another instance may probably be given from Eur. *Bacch.* 962, *μόνος γὰρ εἰμ' αὐτῶν ἀνὴρ τολμῶν τόδε*. Here Dr. Paley suggests *ἀσπῶν* (in which he has been anticipated by Elmsley), and although there is no difficulty in *αὐτῶν*, yet *ἀσπῶν* gives much more point to the reply of Dionysus, *μόνος οὐ πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις, μόνος*.

R. C. SEATON.

AESCHYLUS, *Agamemnon* 555-7.

*μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαναίλας,
σπαργὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους, —τί δ' οὐ
στένωτες, οὐ λαχόντες ἡματος μέρος;*

Mr. Paley translates the last line thus: 'in a word, what was there that we had not to lament, what that we did not receive as our daily portion?' He apparently repeats *τί* with *οὐ λαχόντες*, which seems a very doubtful construction, not supported by his citation from Eurip. *Androm.* (l. 450), and *ἡματος μέρος*, as has often been pointed out, could hardly mean 'daily portion.' Professor Kennedy reads *λάσ-κοτες* and interprets, 'when were we not groaning and shouting any fraction of a day?' remarking in a note that *λαχόντες* is 'unmeaning.' Mr. A. Sidgwick suggests *πάσγοντες* or *κλαίοντες*.

I do not believe that *λαχόντες* is corrupt. A much slighter change than is involved in any remedy hitherto proposed for *λαχόντες* will give an apt and definite sense. The complaint of the herald is that the ships were inconveniently crowded; the deckways were narrow and ill-provided with means of resting (*κακοστρώτους*); there was but scant room for sitting or reclining. By changing the breathing of *ἡματος* we obtain a most appropriate meaning—

οὐ λαχόντες ἡματος μέρος.

Translate, 'If I were to tell of our hardships and inclement bivouacs, of the narrow deck passages, ill-strewn with bedding—and of all our groans, when we failed to obtain a place on the seats (lit. a share of a seat).' There was only room for some of the soldiers to sit down; those who had to stand—perhaps they took it by lot, *λαχόντες*—groaned. *στένω* is the appropriate word, as it suggests the physical pressure of thronging.

ἡμα bears the same relation to the perfect-present *ἡμαι* as *χρήμα*, *ῥῆμα*, *κτῆμα* to *κέχρημαι*, *εἰρημαι*, *κέκτημαι*.

J. B. BURY.

SOPHOCLES, *Philoctetes* 41 f.

*κἄστ' οὐχ ἱκός που· πῶς γὰρ ἂν νοσῶν ἀνὴρ
κῶλον παλαιῇ κηρὶ προσβαλὴ μακρὰν;*

It is difficult to believe that *προσβαλὴ* is genuine. I used to explain it by supposing that Odysseus, standing outside of the cave, is thinking of all movement *from* the cave as movement *towards* himself and his comrade. But we certainly seem to require a compound with *πρό*. (*καὶ βαλὴ* would suffice, indeed; but the change of *καὶ* to *προσ* would remain a mystery.) As minuscule *κ* so often became *β*, the true reading may be *προσκάζοι* ('limp forth'). *προσ-βάζοι* would quickly have generated *προσβαλὴ*.

R. C. JEBB.

A FRAGMENT OF SOPHOCLES.—When quoting a new bit of Euripides from L. Cohn's *Zu den Paroemiographen* (C. R. ii. 42), I should have added that the Paris MS. which contains it contains also, as it seems, a new line of Sophocles. In a gloss (p. 70) on *βοιώτιος νόμος* almost identical with Zenobius II. 65, there is a quotation:—

*ἔταν τις αἰδῆθ' τὸν βοιώτιον νόμον
τά πρώτα μὲν σχολαῖον εὐτονος αἶ.*

The first line is given by Zen. and is known to editors (Dind. no. 858, Nauck. 878). The second is new; *εὐτονος* should perhaps be *εὐτόνω*. Another gloss in the same MS. (p. 71) refers the phrase *Σιλφίου λειμῶν* (Dind. 945, Nauck. 734) to the 'Triptolemus.' It was hitherto among the 'ἀδῆλων δραμάτων,' quoted from Hesychius.

F. HAVERFIELD.

ARISTOPHANES, *Aves* 194-5.—*μὰ γῆν . . . μὴ γὰρ νόημα κομψότερον ἤκουσά πο*. Editors (e.g. Mr. W. C. Green) find a difficulty in *μὴ . . . ἤκουσα*. They compare *μὴ* with future, *Lysistr.* 917, &c., but add that the future construction is different. Should one not put both passages in the same category as the indic. with oaths in Homer (*Monro, Gr.* § 358), e.g. *Iliad* 10, 329, *ἴστω Ζεὺς . . . μὴ . . . ἐποχήσεται ἄλλος* so 15, 36 (*μὴ* and present)? This is quite distinct from the elliptic idioms.

F. HAVERFIELD.

PLATO, *Rep.* 498 A.—*Νῦν μὲν, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, οἱ καὶ ἀπτόμενοι (φιλοσοφίας) μεῖράκια ὄντα ἄρτι ἐκ παίδων τὸ μεταξὺ οἰκονομίας καὶ χρηματισμοῦ πλησιάζαντες αὐτοῦ τῷ χαλεπωτάτῳ ἀπαλλάττονται*. This can hardly mean 'in the intervals of business,' because that sense is certainly inappropriate here. *μεταξὺ* 'between' is however sometimes used in a peculiar way. Instead of a thing being between A and B, it is sometimes said to be between B, so that *μεταξὺ* practically means 'on this side of,' 'short of,' 'before reaching.' See Shilleto's note on Dem. *περὶ παραπροσβέας* § 181, where several illustrative passages are quoted. Plato seems therefore to mean that youths just dabble in philosophy after emerging from boyhood and before they begin to manage property or conduct business, when in Malvolio's phrase 'it is with them in standing water, between boy and man.'

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ST. MATTHEW xxvi. 45.—Professor Palmer has suggested an ingenious interpretation to remove the well-known difficulty of this verse. But will τὸ λοιπὸν bear the meaning which he gives to it? Can it be used as = μετὰ ταῦτα or ὑστερον? It seems to me that it regularly denotes a future time starting from the present or a fixed period, rather than an indefinite future. Thus Xen. *Anab.* 2, 2, 5 says, τὸ λοιπὸν ὁ μὲν ἤρχεν, i.e. directly after the departure of the general, = 'henceforth', 'henceforward'. And what is more to the point, we find a close parallel in Heb. 10, 13, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος, 'henceforth waiting', i.e. from the point of time at which ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ. On reading over the passages from the synoptical Gospels it struck me at once that SS. Matthew and Mark may be reconciled with S. Luke by simply adding a note of interrogation—Καθεύετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε; and this agrees with the question as given in ver. 40, when Christ first approached. Finding his disciples sleeping for the third time, notwithstanding his injunction γρηγορεῖτε, Jesus asks in a tone of sorrowful rebuke, 'Are ye sleeping and resting for what still remains (*quod superest*, Beza) of my time (before capture)?' This interpretation had commended itself to me before examining the versions. On doing so I found that the French and German coincided in adopting this—the former reading, *Vous dormez encore et vous vous reposez?* the latter *Ach, wollt ihr nun schlafen und ruhen?* Cf. Hom. *Il.* 23, 69, Εὐδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμείοι λελασμένοις ἔστεν, Ἀχιλλεῦ, where the verb may equally well be used interrogatively. The other versions—Beza, Douay, Ital., Span., Dutch, follow the A.V. in taking the verb as an imperative, but the Ital. clearly brings out the force of τὸ λοιπὸν, *Dormite pure da ora innanzi*. Another method will suggest itself, by which the sense, though not the form, of the Gospels may be reconciled, viz. to translate καθεύετε as an indicative. Assuming this to be correct, we suppose Christ to approach and, finding his disciples again asleep, he says half regretfully and half reproachfully, 'Ye are sleeping and resting (instead of watching and praying) during the little time that is left to me, which will in sense harmonize with S. Luke's 'Why are ye sleeping?' To get rid of the difficulty, as some do, by supposing Christ to tell his disciples to sleep on, and then, allowing an interval of some time to elapse, to say ἀνέχει (= ἰκανὸν ἔστιν, S. Luke 22, 38), is surely straining the point too much, as nothing is implied in the first two Gospels, leading us to think that Christ went away, or allowed an interval to intervene, after the word ἀναπαύεσθε. As our Lord's words, then, in the third Gospel are undoubtedly interrogative, and as his similar words on the same occasion, as recorded by the first two, may be interrogative, I think it is at once safer and more rational for us to treat them as such than to adopt an unusual interpretation of a common Greek word.

LAUNCELOT DOWDALL.

* *

A MISINTERPRETED PASSAGE IN PAUSANIAS.—In Pausanias' account of the city of Boura in Achaia (vii. 25, 8) we read as follows: Ναὸς ἐν ταῖς Δῆμητρος, ὃ δὲ Ἀφροδίτης Διονύσου τέ ἐστι καὶ ἄλλος Εἰλευθίας· λίθου τοῦ Πεντελέσιου τὰ ἀγάλματα, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἔργα Εὐκλείδου καὶ τῇ Δῆμητρὶ ἔστιν ἐσθῆς. We have mentioned then three shrines, and statues of the four divinities to whom the shrines are dedicated, carved out of Pentelic marble by the Athenian sculptor Eucleides. The brief description seems to end here, but the sentence that follows has caused difficulty. It has been referred to by Bernoulli in his 'Aphrodite,' p. 11, and by Prof. Gardner (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*,

vol. vii. 1, p. 92) and both writers suppose that the words must mean 'and Demeter is here represented by Eucleides as draped,' and both at once perceive the necessary implication to be that the statues of Dionysos, Aphrodite and Eileithyia are nude: and both are reluctant to admit that this could have been true. The implication is necessary, because a writer who is describing four statues—one of which is Demeter's,—and who expressly states, 'Demeter's is clothed', must mean to express in an allusive manner, as though he blushed at the admission of the fact, that the others were nude; for unless he meant this, the words as translated above would have no meaning at all, since Demeter was always represented in drapery and an undraped Demeter would be a sheer impossibility. Mr. Shilleto in his translation of Pausanias feels no embarrassment or sense of difficulty, but simply translates 'and Demeter is clothed.' Quite apart from the question whether the Greek words could bear this meaning, archaeological evidence would be conclusive against this interpretation of the passage; for a nude Eileithyia is, I believe, as impossible a figure as a nude Demeter. We find only those female divinities represented in Greek sculpture as undraped to whom the display of personal charm is important (such as Aphrodite and the Charites), and Eileithyia is not one of these, being identified by Pausanias and grouped by Pindar with the Fates—hence her epithet *ἑλωος*—and being of close kin to Hera. The statue of this austere goddess of birth and fate was entirely enveloped in drapery at Athens, was clad in a fine robe at Aegion, was shrouded from the eyes of all save her priestess at Corinth: so that if Pausanias had found at Boura a naked Eileithyia he would certainly have called attention to this in clearer words than he has used.

In fact the words of the text are entirely against the rendering mentioned above: the style of Pausanias is generally simple and straightforward, but such a phrase as τῇ Δῆμητρὶ ἔστιν ἐσθῆς, if meaning 'the statue of Demeter is clothed,' is very unnatural at least, even if it is possible Greek. Again, the particle καὶ does not give a natural connection for the sentence; if he wished to say that the other statues were nude, but that of Demeter was draped, we might have expected some such sentence as τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἀγάλματα γυμνά ἐστι, τὸ δὲ Δῆμητρος χιτῶνι κεκάλυπται or χιτῶνά ἐστιν ἐνδεδυμένον.

The disputed sentence seems through its position and through its initial particle to introduce a separate fact, to record a new object; and it can only mean, that 'there is a raiment for the Demeter of the shrine,' that is to say, that in the shrine was preserved a sacred raiment to be worn by the statue on solemn occasions. The practice of weaving and preserving such drapery for the statues of divinities is well known, and this interpretation delivers us from the insinuation of an undraped Eileithyia.

L. R. FARNELL.

* *

AN EPITAPH FOUND AT PHOLEGANDROS.—Kaibel (*Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta*, Berolini, 1878) gives (190) *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* N. 2445, thus: 'Pholegandri, Anaglypho senex cum cane exsculptus.' The fifth line ends ἥ δὲ συνήμαν, the sixth begins ΛΑΘΑ εἰς ἀφανὴ τόνδε . . .

In his notes he says of the epitaph: Melioris certe artis quam ut Boeckhii emendationem Λάθα v. 6 pro vera habes, unde nec supplementum ejus recepi τόνδε μ' ἔκρυψε τάφον. Correcting ἥ δὲ in v. 5, I would read v. 6 as follows:

Λάθα[μ'] εἰς ἀφανὴ τόνδε[καθ' ἑκὸν τάφον].

J. HOSKINS ABRAHALL.

In my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Part II. (J.H.S. 1887), I published a fragment of a *senatus consultum*, which I found at Oinía, a small station of Phrygia Magna on the important trade-route from Ephesus and Apameia to Cappadocia and the East. I did not fully appreciate its historical importance, until soon after Prof. Mommsen wrote to me on the subject. The date is B.C. 116, and the *πρεσβευταί εἰς Ἀσίαν διαβόητες* who are mentioned are the ambassadors sent to regulate the affairs of the province of Asia after the death of Mithradates Euergetes in B.C. 120. Phrygia, which had been given to Mithradates by M. Aquilius in 129, was now taken possession of by the Romans, and it appears from this inscription that their first act was to confirm all the arrangements of the late king.

W. M. RAMSAY.

* *

PLAUTUS, *Amphitruo* 1072 [v. 1, 28].

Bromia loquitur :

Erilis praevertit metus: accúrro, ut sciscam quid velit.

Atque filiam geminos filios pueros peperisse cónspicor : Neque nóstrum quisquam sénsimus, quum peperit, neque providimus.

Séd quid hoc, quis hic ést senex qui ante aedis nostras sic jacet ?

Bromia sees Amphitruo lying speechless. Why Amphitruo, an active warrior, lately married, should be called *senex* is a mystery. Read, keeping the octonarian metre of the first three lines :

Sed quid hóc ? quis hic est, séminex qui ante aedis nostras sic jacet ?

This is the only instance of *seminex* in the nominative ; it is common in the oblique cases. As to the scansion of *hic* I shall have something to say elsewhere.

A. PALMER.

* *

[CAESAR], *B.G.* viii. praef. § 2.—*Caesaris nostri commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae non comparantibus* (PRMVTLU ; *comparentibus*, A, so too the ed. Rom. of 1469) *superioribus atque insequentibus eius scriptis contextui novissimumque imperfectum ab rebus gestis Alexandriae confecti &c.* I venture to rescue from the obscurity of a school-book the following note that appeared in my edition of the eighth book published in 1885, in the hope that it may be thought deserving of consideration : 'Suetonius, *Iul.* 56, says *reliqui et rerum suarum commentarios Gallici civilisque belli Pompeiani, nam Alexandrini Africique et Hispaniensis incertus auctor est : alii Oppium putant, alii Hirtium qui etiam Gallici belli novissimum imperfectumque suppleverit.* The words *novissimum imperfectumque* are evidently taken by Suetonius from the present passage, though wrongly applied by him : is his *suppleverit* also suggested by the present passage ? I believe it is, and that Hirtius wrote *commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae non comparantes supplevi*

superioribus atque insequentibus eius scriptis contextui &c. I suppose *supplevi* to have dropped out in consequence of the repetition of the syllable *sup-*, and then *comparentes* became altered, by assimilation to the following *superioribus*, to *comparentibus* or *comparantibus*. Perhaps *commentarium...comparentem* would be an improvement on the above, cf. 48 end.

A. G. PESKETT.

* *

JUVENAL x. 54.

'Ergo supervacua aut perniciose petuntur, propter quae fas est genua incrare deorum ?'

Against Lachmann's 'aut ne perniciose petuntur' and Munro's 'aut ut perniciose petuntur' it may be argued that their order of words belongs to Horace rather than to Juvenal and that their sentences are harsh. Moreover such a question as they supposed to be put is hardly in place here and should rather occur at 346, 'nil ergo optabant homines ?' Madvig's 'incrare' is unnecessary, as will, I think, appear below. Bücheler's 'aut quae,' making two questions, is weak and probably open to the same objection as to the order of words.

In the *Journal of Philology*, viii. 272, Mr. Joseph B. Mayor suggested *petuntur* for *petuntur*, inserting *vel* after *aut* and translating 'accordingly those things for which it is really right to pray (such as modesty and honesty) are reckoned superfluous or even injurious.' He allows however that 'this reading leaves a harshness in the connexion.' I had hit upon much the same conjecture before I saw his note, reading *petuntur* for *petuntur* (the corruption may have arisen from the apparently similar 'nocturna petuntur' of l. 8). Then keeping the interrogation and inserting 'haec' after 'supervacua' or either 'et' or 'vel' after 'aut,' I should translate 'Are we then to deem those things superfluous or even baneful, for which men prefer innocent prayer to heaven ?' In answer to this question Juvenal goes on to show by examples that they are baneful to many, and so we are brought to the parallel question 'nil ergo optabant homines ?' A still closer parallel is i. 158 :

'Qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita echatur pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos ?'

Juvenal often puts these questions to himself or supposes some one to put them to him.

'Fas est' does not mean that they are in reality altogether wise and right petitions, but either that they are innocent and not like the prayer of the man in Horace, 'da mihi fallere' : or that they are thought right, as in the ironical vi. 628. 'iam iam privignum occidere fas est.

XIV. 24.

'Quem mire afficiunt inscripta ergastula, carcer'

According to Bücheler Herwerden has suggested 'inscripta, ergastula, carcer.' Perhaps Juvenal wrote 'inscripti,' as in Martial vii. 95. 9, 'quattuor inscripti portabant vile cadaver.' I do not find any example given of 'inscriptum' for 'a brand.'

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

VARIOUS NOTES.

I.

A VASE-PAINTING AFTER ZEUXIS.

AMONG the recent acquisitions of the British Museum is a large krater on the front of which is painted in a somewhat florid manner a representation of the infant Herakles strangling the serpents in presence of Alkmena, Zeus and a number of deities. The scene is an apt illustration of the words of Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxxv. 63):—*Magnificus est et Jupiter in throno adstantibus diis et Hercules infans dracones strangulans Alkmena matre coram pavente et Amphitryone*. These are the words with which Pliny describes a picture by Zeuxis, and there is not I think any reason to doubt that this celebrated picture of Zeuxis has been copied by the painter of our vase to the best of his ability, and subject to the very different conditions under which he had to labour. We cannot expect to see reproduced the touch of a great master, still less the light and shadow or the illusions of perspective with which he charmed his contemporaries. Nevertheless the vase is an artistic souvenir—and the only one we possess—of a picture which was famous for several centuries in antiquity. But the vase has some interest also in another respect. Welcker had been led (*Imagines Philostrat.* p. 607) to break up the sentence just quoted from Pliny into a description of two separate pictures, the one representing *Jupiter in throno adstantibus diis*, the other *Hercules infans &c.* It has been the custom since then to follow Welcker; but our vase now shows that he was wrong, and that the whole sentence must be taken to refer to one great picture.

In the foreground of the picture are the infants Herakles and Iphikles, the former seizing a serpent by the throat, the latter jumping up in horror from the second serpent while a gray-haired nurse bends down with outstretched hands to save him. On the right of this scene stands Athene with all her armour and holding out in her right hand a bird. She holds it by the wings in the manner of a person bringing an offering, as on the Harpy tomb, possibly an offering in connection with the birth of the twin infants. On the left of the central incident are Hermes seated but looking

eagerly round, and Artemis standing with her bow ready to slay the serpents if need be. Immediately above the central group is Apollo seated and holding a large branch of laurel, much as on the vase from Marion in Cyprus representing Oedipus slaying the Sphinx. Here, as there, he probably indicates Thebes as the locality of the incident. In other words he is Apollo Ismenios.

Higher up on the vase are, on the right, Dionysos seated, holding out a kantharos in his left hand, with a sceptre and vine branch leaning against his right side. On the left is seated Zeus with thunderbolt in left hand and a sceptre in his right. A female figure whom I take to be Alkmena throws her left arm round his neck and points vigorously with her right hand down to the infants and the serpents. I think the action suits the *matre pavente* of Pliny. But Zeus merely turns his head and looks into her face. Two Erotes fly towards this group. On the reverse of the vase are painted Satyrs and Nymphs.

It will be noticed that the figure of Amphitryon which is included in Pliny's description is absent from our vase. He is included also in the picture described in Philostrat. *Jun. 5*, in an actual painting found at Herculaneum (*Pittura d' Ercolano*, I. pl. 7) and on a Greek vase of good style (*Monumenti dell' Inst.* xi. pl. 42, fig. 2). These three sources, however, differ so much among themselves that they cannot all be held to go back to one and the same original. Even if they could be held to go back to an original by Zeuxis, it would still be more reasonable to assume that they had omitted to copy the upper part of the picture—possibly owing to difficulties of perspective—than that our vase-painter had combined two separate pictures by Zeuxis into one, the more so as the picture he has given us is altogether one in subject and sentiment.

II.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PHOENISSAE.

In the British Museum is a small fragment of a vase, the design on which, including the inscription, has been produced from a mould. The design represents a bent old man, stooping forward with hands

stretched towards the ground. Above him is the following inscription in three lines:—

ΙΟΥΣΚΕΛΕΥΕΙΑΓΕ
ΙΤΩΜΑΤΗΣΑΥΤΟΥΜΗ
ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣΚΑΙΤΩΝΥΙΩΝ

Taking into consideration a vase in Athens (*Ephemeris Archaeologike*, 1887, pl. 5) on which are represented in a manner resembling that of our fragment scenes from the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, and having a belief that the bent old man on our fragment was Oedipus, I have with the help of the *Phoenissae* restored the inscription as follows:—

Οἰδίπους κελεύει ἄγειν πρὸς
τὸ πτόμα τῆς αὐτοῦ μητρὸς
καὶ γυναῖκός καὶ τῶν υἱῶν.

In the *Phoenissae*, v. 1693, Oedipus asks Antigone to lead him to the body of his mother and wife that he may touch it, προσάγαγε νῦν με μητρὸς ὡς ψάψω σέθεν. That done, he next asks, v. 1697, Ἐτεοκλέους δὲ πτόμα Πολυνείκους τε ποῦ; Apparently it is at this stage of the drama that he is represented on our fragment, and doubtless the designs on the whole vase had been devoted to the illustration of the *Phoenissae* of Euripides. We have in v. 1482 πτόματα νεκρῶν τρισσῶν to indicate the dead bodies of Iokasta, Eteokles, and Polyneikes. On the right of Oedipus there is to be seen part of a shield which may be associated with the combat of the two brothers in a preceding act of the drama. In that case the various scenes on our vase would have followed in order from right to left, as seems also to have been the case on the Athens vase. The inscription on our fragment was published in the *Arch. Zeitung*, 1873, p. 109, without explanation and not quite accurately.

III.

SCULPTURES ON TEMPLE AT DELPHI.

In connection with Prof. Middleton's paper on the temple of Apollo at Delphi read at the last meeting of the Hellenic Society I may be allowed to mention here a passage of Euripides (*Ion*, v. 184) on which I had occasion to offer some remarks last year in the *Hellenic Journal* (VIII. p. 4). The Chorus, consisting of the attendants of Kreusa, finding themselves in front of the temple of Apollo at Delphi take to admiring the sculptures on it. Naturally they look up first to the pediment διδύμων προσώπων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς. Bringing their gaze downwards they next notice the

metopes and select from them two groups of Herakles with Iolaos slaying the Hydra and Bellerophon slaying the Chimaera, these subjects being appropriate to the plot of the *Ion*. They then, as I conceive, advance up the steps of the temple, and looking upwards behold the frieze on the cella walls, whereupon they exclaim, v. 206, σκέψαι κλόνον ἐν τείχεσι λαῖνοισι Γιγάντων. Among the deities fighting with giants they single out certain familiar groups and, that done, they advance to the door of the temple and ask about admission, v. 220. We have thus a picture of the three great elements of sculpture on a Greek temple, the pediments, the metopes and the frieze. Unfortunately it has long been the custom to recognise in the Chorus of Euripides a reference to only the pediments and metopes, and this has arisen from the poet's having signalled certain sets of combatants in the Gigantomachia of the frieze much in the same manner as he had signalled the actual groups of the metopes. But he has very plainly indicated by the words κλόνον ἐν τείχεσι λαῖνοισι Γιγάντων that at this point he turns to the frieze. It would in fact be impossible to have a 'tumult of giants' in the metopes, whereas the appropriateness of such a subject for a frieze is familiar to us from the sculptures of Pergamon and of Priene; nor could metopes be said to be on the walls of a temple. Besides, after mentioning the Giants the Chorus find themselves at the door of the temple and were therefore just in the position where the frieze of the cella was meant to be seen from.

A. S. MURRAY.

NOTES.

CERAMIC GULF.—Mr. W. R. Paton writes: 'I went recently from Ceramus to Moughla on foot, through the country behind the high mountains which overlook the gulf, most of the way through a continuous forest of pines. The scenery is beautiful, and must be still more beautiful in spring. I neither saw nor heard of any inscriptions or other traces of Hellenic occupation in this region until approaching Moughla. East of the high road from Giora (Idyma) to Moughla and about an hour west of the village of Oula are the remains of a Hellenic city, which have possibly escaped the notice of Mr. Kiepert in his former and recent journeys. There is an acropolis fortified almost entirely by nature and difficult of access, and below this on the 'col' to the south the ruins of a small theatre. Not far from the theatre are some rock tombs, the largest of which resembles closely in its architecture the tomb near Giora figured after a sketch by Kiepert in Hirschfeld's *Paphlagonische Felsengräber*, p. 50. The details of this tomb are more elaborate and the workmanship is neater, and on the architrave is cut the name of the owner in letters which cannot be

earlier than the third century B.C. The Giora tomb must be nearly contemporary with it. I found no clue to the name of this city. It may be Bargasa, which I sought for in vain elsewhere; but if so one ought to find coins of Bargasa (not very uncommon in the market) in the neighbourhood, and I saw none. Some 'architectural' rock tombs in another part of Caria, much further west near Pasha Liman, must be still later than these. The details there are worked not in the wall, but in the stucco, and there still remain traces of frescoes on the outer wall of the chamber. I have seen no tombs cut in the rock in Caria which I believe to be of very early date. The early tombs are all built.

On the southern shore of the gulf I saw nothing of interest except a very well preserved fortress (not indicated in the chart) on the west side of the bay of Seyout. The whole wall with the gates and towers remain. It was probably concealed by thick wood, since burnt, at the time the survey was made: from thence to the Dorian Isthmus the whole country is, and has seemingly always been a desert. There is not a living soul to be found there now: in summer it is visited by Yourouks.

W. R. PATON.

CONSTANTINOPLE.—The condition of the Imperial museum at Constantinople is rather deplorable just now, for every other interest has of late been sacrificed to the construction of the new hall, which is being prepared for the sarcophagi from Sidon. The vestibule of the museum is crowded to excess with bas-reliefs and other works of art which are constantly pouring in and the provenance of which is hopelessly forgotten. The objects found recently in Thasos, consisting of an archaic torso of Apollo, a fine Roman statue and other things, were left to rot all last winter in the garden, a fatal thing for objects of Thasiote marble which is peculiarly soft. Again we hear that for the restoration of the pier at Bebek on the Bosphorus ship-loads of marble are being brought from the mines of Iassos in Karia; two important inscriptions were discovered amongst these, and the subject-matter, which was luckily copied before they were buried in the sea, will be published shortly in the *Hellenic Journal*.

J. T. BENT.

SIRINA.—The small island rock, anciently known as Sirina, now as Hagios Joannis, occupies a somewhat important position in the Aegean Sea, as one of the stepping-stones by which the earlier inhabitants of Karia must have travelled westwards; it has two good harbours, one to the north, and one to the south, and is placed midway in a long stretch of sea between Karpathos and Astypalaea, in both of which islands traces of this prehistoric race have been found. Having carefully examined Anaphi, an island lying to the west of this line of route, and having found there no traces whatsoever of this early population, and knowing that Astypalaea, Amorgos, Naxos and Paros are full of their tombs, I was considerably interested in discovering in the ruins of a square fortress on Sirina quantities of obsidian knives, which at once identified this rock with the race in question, and proved to us that they made use of it as a halting-place on their way to and from the marble quarries of Paros; in fact Parian marble, objects of which are so frequently found in their tombs, would seem to have been their chief quest in these westward migrations.

J. T. BENT.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. *a.* Etruscan mirror in bronze with bone handle. On the mirror is incised a design of Perseus ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\mu\epsilon$), Athene ($\Lambda\omega\epsilon\eta\epsilon\delta\phi\alpha$) and Hermes ($\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon\tau$). Athene holds up the head of Medusa, the face of which appears to be reflected in a pool at her feet. The same subject, differently treated, is represented on mirrors in Gerhard's *Etruskische Spiegel* I., pll. 122-124.

b. An archaic bronze disk, decorated with perforated patterns.

2. A series of objects found by Mr. George Dennis in his excavation in 1882 at the tumuli of Bin Tepé at Sardes, supposed to be the tombs of the early Lydian kings, and presented by him.

a. A phiale, nearly hemispherical in form, with a circle incised at foot for steadying the vase on a flat surface. The exterior is plain, and badly baked, the colour tending from black to red. In the interior on a brownish varnish is painted a large star within a band of zigzags, all in a dull white pigment: the star has ten rays, five of which are long, the alternate ones short.

b. Vase (form that of Van Olfers, *Lydischen Königsgräber*, Taf. V., 8, 9) of deep red glaze with decorations in black glaze: the technique is that of the Dipylon type. On the shoulder is a broad band of black on which the ornament has been formed by drawing the brush round in close wavy horizontal lines, giving the appearance of the texture of the early variegated glass vases. The same pattern occurs on the upper surface of the flat lip: the base is wanting.

c. Vase of similar shape and ornamentation to *b*: complete.

d. Vase of similar shape and technique: the ornament has been applied by letting the vase while on the wheel touch against a broad brush, leaving thin washes of black in various directions.

e. Vase of same form, but of Mycenaean technique, *i.e.* covered with a white varnish, on which are drawn plain horizontal lines in black varnish.

f. Same form and ornament as *c*.

g. Eight fragments of a vase of similar technique to *c*, with a band of decoration in brown divided off into panels by triglyphs: in each panel is a horizontal bar of brown: the form cannot be determined.

3. A series of objects acquired during the recent excavations in Cyprus, and presented by the Cyprus Excavation Fund. These objects will shortly be published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, with a full report of the excavations.

a. A marble head of a boy, rather below life-size: probably a head of Eros, and from a group of Eros and Aphrodite, as one side of the head is more carelessly worked than the other. Graeco-Roman work of no special merit or interest.

b. A gold pin, $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches long; the head is in the form of the capital of a Corinthian column: out of the acanthus leaves project four bulls' heads, similar to the bull's head capitals in Persepolitan architecture: these support an abacus, on the four corners of which are seated doves drinking out of cups. The whole is surmounted by a ball of some vitreous (?) material, and above this again is a pearl, both set in gold. Down the pin runs an inscription recording the name of the lady who dedicated it 'to Aphrodite of Paphos,' in dotted letters of about the end of the third century B.C.

c. Fragments of a r.f. rhyton of fine Athenian style: decorated with two bands of figures of which parts are preserved. Above is the making of Pandora (the upper part of this scene with about half of each

figure seems to have been cut away in antiquity). Below, the hunt of the Kalydonian boar.

d. Fragments of a Panathenaic amphora of the end of the fourth century B.C., giving part of the shield and drapery of Athene, and two letters of the usual *Των Ἀθηνησεν Ἀθλῶν*.

e. Two aryballi of red ware.

f. Two-handled cup of green glazed ware.

g. Three fragments of marble statuettes.

h. Marble slab of an altar with a dedication in Greek.

i. Part of a marble slab with a fragmentary letter of King Antiochus to Ptolemy Alexander in reference to certain people in Pieria (Seleucia) who had rendered services to his father, and had received in return certain privileges, apparently in regard to temple lands.

k. Upper part of a marble stele with a list of persons announced as contributing to the Eleio-christion.

l. Two gold earrings, and fragments of a go'd wreath.

a-c and h-k of the above were found on the site of the temple of Aphrodite at Paphos.

The Department of Glass has also received from the same source several interesting pieces of Graeco-Roman glass, including one vase uncoloured, on the inside of the lid of which is drawn in ink a picture of Eros.

CECIL SMITH.

Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums, vols. II. and III. Edited by A. BAUMEISTER.

DR. BAUMEISTER and his contributors are to be congratulated on the completion of this extensive work, and on the punctual publication of the sixty-nine Lieferungen of which it consists. Part I. appeared early in 1884, and the first twenty parts—forming vol. I.—have already been noticed in the *Classical Review* (vol. I. p. 202). The last part of vol. III. (numbered '68': there are two parts numbered '29') appeared about October 1888. Readers who (like the present reviewer) originally subscribed to the book on the understanding that they were to get a Classical Dictionary for two pounds will be distressed to find that the actual cost of the work (without binding) is three pounds, nine shillings; but the enlargement of the *Denkmäler* from forty to sixty-nine Lieferungen was no doubt unavoidable, and the work has been thereby much improved. Baumeister's *Denkmäler* deals with a host of topics—art, mythology, antiquities, custom, iconography, topography. It was impossible to treat all these subjects exhaustively, and in many instances bibliographical details and references to the ancient authors are wanting, or are, at any rate, incomplete. On the other hand, the work

contains a number of the most elaborate and carefully written articles, and the illustrations—the main feature of the undertaking—are, with some notable exceptions, satisfactory and useful. In the whole work there are 2401 illustrations inserted in the text and about 100 plates. An index is given at the end. Among the more elaborate articles in volumes II. and III. may be mentioned the following:—'Lustspiel,' 'Malerei,' 'Mausoleum,' 'Münzkunde,' 'Mykenae,' 'Niketempel,' 'Olympia,' 'Oresteia,' 'Palaeographie,' 'Paris,' 'Pantheon,' 'Pergamon,' 'Pheidias' (and other sculptors), 'Polychromie,' 'Pompeji,' 'Rom,' 'Sarkophage,' 'Seewesen,' 'Theatergebäude,' 'Thermen,' 'Theseion,' 'Theseus,' 'Toga' (on Roman dress), 'Vasenkunde,' 'Waffen,' 'Wettkämpfe.' Now that the book is complete, minute criticisms of individual articles would probably serve no useful purpose. One or two defects, indeed, are especially striking, such as the absence of any article on *Lunus* (*Mên*), and the imperfect illustration of 'Kentauren,' 'Sarapis,' and 'Steinschneidekunst.' I would also remark that throughout the work—with a few exceptions—insufficient recourse has been had to the invaluable mythological illustration derivable from coins. Thus, in the article 'Nilus' the well-known Vatican statue is reproduced, but nothing is said of the numerous representations of Nilus on the coins of Alexandria. In the section on river-gods in the article 'Personifikationen' no account is taken of the numerous and beautiful representations of water-divinities on Sicilian and other Hellenic coins. One other mistake which should strike archaeologists no less than numismatists is the reproduction of portrait (and other) coins by engraving instead of by some mechanical process. Theoretically, an engraving of an ancient coin is as good or better than a photograph of it. In practice it never is. The numismatic wood-cutter never catches a likeness, and modernises or caricatures nearly every Greek coin that he attempts to reproduce. In reviewing volume I., I ventured to suggest that the engraving of coins, particularly those bearing portraits, should be supplemented later on in the work by a series of photographic plates. It is to be regretted that something of this kind has not been attempted, especially as considerable space in the *Denkmäler* is devoted to iconography. The usefulness of the article 'Münzkunde,' entrusted to the very competent hands of Dr. Weil, is greatly impaired by the adoption of engravings—few of which retain the true spirit of the original coins. Yet in spite of these and some other shortcomings, it cannot be doubted that Dr. Baumeister and his fellow-workers have compiled a very serviceable and interesting work, and for this they deserve all thanks.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. IX. 1. No. 33.

The Origin of the recessive accent in Greek: Maurice Bloomfield. This important article is both a severe criticism of Wheeler's 'Der Griechische Nominal-Accent' [reviewed *C.R.* I. 103], and an extension of the writer's first article [*A.J.P.* IV. 21] which Wheeler attacked. Both base their views on Wackernagel's well-known discovery 'that the so-called

"recessive" accent in the finite forms of the Gk. verb represents a substitute for an older Ind.-Eur. fact in sentence-accentuation, to wit, that the finite verb in principal clauses was treated as an enclitic.' In opposition to Wheeler's theory that 'recession' is due to the development of a secondary accent, and that this secondary accent was caused by a phonetic law which operated as much upon the noun as upon the verb, Bloomfield seeks to show that Wheeler fails to account for the facts, especially in Aeolic, and re-

asserts his position: 'the recessive accent in the verbal forms is enclisis, or rather a substitute for it, therefore a grammatical quantity, which covers the entire ground; in the noun it is secondary, no doubt analogical, apparently on the way towards absorbing it. This process of absorption is complete in the Aeolic dialect.' However he retracts his previous surmise that 'the Ind.-Eur. enclisis of vocatives and their qualifying words in the middle of a sentence formed the bridge for the transfer of the enclitic accentuation from verb to noun,' and now prefers to regard the transition from verb to noun as having taken place by a kind of analogy, viz. analogy of sound. Hermann Collitz discusses the origin of the weak preterite in Teutonic languages. J. Rendel Harris on the (Latin) 'Sortes Sanctorum' in the St. Germain Cod. of N.T. (g) gives some account of the system of divination there exhibited, and by a comparison with the Greek *Sortes* in the Cod. Bezae shows that both are parts of the same original scheme. He thence concludes that there was a time when the original of the St. Germain Cod. in St. John, and probably the Cod. itself, was in the same library with the Cod. Bezae. G. L. Kittredge suggests that a passage of Chaucer's Pardoner's Tale is taken from Maximianus Eleg. I. R. C. Seaton contributes several corrections and omissions of Liddell and Scott in connexion with Apoll. Rhod. Among the reviews are Langen's *Plantinische Studien* (E. P. Morris), 'the subject discussed is the origin and meaning of the repetitions of thought and inconsistencies of plot which occur in the plays of Plautus, a book not only indispensable to all students of Plautus but also a model of critical method'; M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sagen und Kunst* (A. Emerson), chiefly valuable as a 'systematic review of the pertinent remains of early Hellenic art.' There are also notices of W. Schmid's *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, and of Upcott's *Introduction to Greek Sculpture*.

Athenaeum: 3 Nov. notices of several school-books, Merry's *Knights*, Snell's *Epitaphios*, Sidgwick's *Eumenides* and *Bucolics*, etc.—17 Nov. review of Mommsen's *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III. 2 (Der Senat), and of H. Paul's *Principles of the History of Language* (transl.).

Academy: 27 Oct. review by Rob. Ellis of Cichorius' *Rom. u. Mytilene*.—3 Nov. review by A. Goodwin of E. C. E. Owen's *Latin Syntax*, and Postgate's *New Latin Primer*.—17 Nov. review by A. W. Benn of Shute's *On the present form of the Aristotelian writings*.

Hermes, vol. xxiii. part 3, contains:

1. J. Toepffer, *Die Attischen Pythiasten und Deliasen*. Controverses the ordinary view that the *Πυθιασταί* and *Δελιασταί* were two ancient sacerdotal gentes, which played an important part in the sacred embassies to Delphi and Delos. This view is based mainly on the testimony of Philochorus (Schol. Soph. O.C. 1047), compared with Strabo ix. 404. But statements of the lexicographers Hesychius and Harpocration, together with notices from Plato, Demosthenes, and a Delphic inscription (C.I.A. II. 550), seem to show that the *Πυθιασταί* and *Δελιασταί* were the actual *θεωροί* sent out, and did not belong to any special gens. A critical examination of the statement of Philochorus proves that he and Strabo are dealing with two completely heterogeneous matters, so that their supposed joint support of the former view is fallacious.

2. Th. Thalheim, *Der Prozess des Androkles gegen Lakritus und seine Urkunde*. A re-opening of the discussion as to the genuineness of the *συγγραφή* in the Lacritus, affirmed by Blass, and denied by Wachsmuth. External evidence being indecisive, Thalheim thinks that a consideration of the relation of the documents to the speech must be the criterion. This leads to the conclusion that the *μαρτυρία* at least are genuine, since there are palpable inconsistencies which a forger would have avoided. Then the objections to the *συγγραφή* itself are considered, and are shown to be insufficient to disprove its genuineness.

3. B. Keil, *Epikritische Isokratesstudien*. (1) A supplementary discussion of the Papyrusblätter in the Museum Borély at Marseilles, containing Isokr. Or. ii. 1-31. (2) A treatment of the supposed interpolations in the Nicoclea, and a suggestion that the interpolated passages come from Aristotle's *Politics*. Reference is also made to the later imitations of the Nicoclea: (a) the letter of the deacon Agapetus to Justinian; (β) the letter of Bishop Photius to his disciple Michael the Bulgarian; (γ) the *ὑποθήκαι βασιλικῆς διαγωγῆς* of Manuel II. Palaiologus. (3) The person to whom Isocrates addressed this oration is said by Constantine Porphyrogenetos to have been Demonikos, king of Cyprus, whom Tzetzes said was a son of Euagoras. Korais and Th. Henkel derided this statement. It is now proved to be correct by the legends of Cyprian coins published by Voüié in 1868. (4) A discussion of the fragmentary text of Isokr. Or. v. 116, 117, published by K. Wessely in the second volume of the *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyri Erzherzog Rainer*.

4. W. Köhler, *Hermokopiden-inschriften*. Three hitherto unknown fragments of the accounts of the sale of the property of the so-called Hermokopidae.

5. Ad. Busse, *Der Historiker und der Philosoph Dexippus*. A. Mai, relying on a statement of Eunapius, and agreeing with Tzetzes, identifies Dexippus the historian with Dexippus the philosopher. An examination however drawn from the Inscriptions relating to the former and the fragments of his writings, and the commentary to the *Categories* of Aristotle by the latter, leads to the conclusion that while the historian was probably born about 201 A.D., the commentary of the latter was written about 350 A.D. Eunapius, nearly a contemporary of the latter, could not have made this mistake, and in fact Mai misunderstood him.

B. Niese, *Das sogenannte Licinisch-Sextisch Ackergesetz*. The ordinary account, based on Livy, is that the Licinian law of 367 B.C., 'ne quis plus quingenta jugera agri possideret,' was renewed by Tib. Gracchus. A comparison of Plutarch (*Tib. Gracchus*, 8) and Appian (*bell. civ. c. 7*, &c.) shows that the law renewed by Gracchus must have been passed some appreciable time after the conquest of Italy, and therefore cannot be the so-called Licinian law. Since Plutarch and Appian depend on the account of Posidonius, while Livy only represents the Augustan annalists, the former are the better authority. Again, the law is stated to have been rendered necessary by the impoverishment and diminution of the free population. This cannot have begun in 367 B.C., when Rome had still before it the wars with the Samnites and Gauls, and in fact all the conquest of Italy. Further, the high maximum allowed of 500 jugera implies a much larger amount of ager publicus than can possibly have existed at that early time, when the conquered land was almost always given *virgatum* or made into colonies. Again, Polybius, Cicero and Diodorus make no mention of the Licinian law. It therefore must disappear from Roman history: the

law to which Plutarch and Appian refer probably dates from between 233 and 140 B.C. This incredibility of the Licinian agrarian law throws some suspicion on the other two Licinian laws, which indeed on other grounds has been expressed by E. Meyer.

7. C. Robert, *Olympische Glossen*. (1) Concerning a tropaion in the Altis, commemorating a victory of the Eleans over the Lacedaemonians; (2) concerning Pausanias' account of the altars in the agora; (3) die Inschriften der Kypseloslade; (4) on the statue of the Eleian Pantarches.

8. A. Wilhelm, *Zur Geschichte der Attischen Kleruchen auf Lemnos*. A discussion of certain fragments of inscriptions recently found, built into the north-east of the Erechtheion. Three fragments were published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1887. Two of these, which fit in to a previously found fragment, form part of a popular decree in honour of a certain Korneas. The third fragment belongs to a decree of the Kleruchic community of Hephastia in Lemnos, also referring to Korneas, as an ambassador to King Seleukos. The date is probably between 306 and 281 B.C. The bearing of the decrees on the position and history of Lemnos at this period is carefully explained.

9. U. Wilcken, *Zu der Berliner Fragmenten der Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία der Aristoteles*. Are these fragments portions of a single codex, as Blass, Bergk, and Landwehr think, or of two loose leaves which a school-boy of Arsinoë has covered with copies? or are they rather fragments of an opisthographic roll? Wilcken gives arguments for taking this third view. His reasons are of a purely technical nature, depending on a consideration of the papyrus material used.

Miscellen.—A. Busse, *Aristot. De Anima III.*, 11, 434^a, 12-15. A. Wilhelm, *Attische Psephisma aus dem Jahre des Kallimachos* 340/s. W. Köhler, *Die Grabstätte bei der Hagia Trias*. L. Holzappel, *Das Capitolinische Jupiter-tempel und der italische Fuss*. E. Wölfflin, *Nachträgliches zur Rettung Scipios am Tessen*.

Hermes, Vol. xxiii. part 4, contains:

1. O. Kern, *Theogonias Orphicae fragmenta nova*.

2. K. Bürger, *Zu Apuleius*. Apuleius introduces his romance by a short preface in which he seems to make certain statements about his own life, which partly agree, partly disagree with other statements in Book XI. In the preface e.g. he says that Greece was his 'vetus prosapia.' The question arises, Who is the person who is the subject of the preface? Is it Apuleius himself or his hero, Lucius of Corinth? E. Rohde (*Rhein. Mus.* XL. 66-91) thinks the latter is impossible. Bürger tries to prove that in this passage where the author promises to give some account of himself, not Apuleius after all, but Lucius of Corinth is the speaker, who combines in his statement certain things true of Apuleius with others true only of himself. And:—

Textkritisches zum pseudo-Lucianischen "Oros". The "Oros" is no original work, but a carelessly-prepared abstract of a much larger romance, and the textual difficulties are mainly to be explained by omissions on the part of the excerptor. A number of passages are here discussed which illustrate either the carelessness of the copyist or the interpolations of the excerptor.

3. M. Rothstein, *De Diris et Lydia carminibus*. Tradition ascribes these poems to Vergil. Scaliger, who considered them to be one poem, conjectured that Valerius Cato was the author—an opinion which, in spite of the disproof of Merkel, Keil, and Hermann,

still has its supporters. Rothstein contends that the style and subjects of the two poems preclude the possibility of their being the work of a common author. In fact they have nothing in common except the mention of Lydia, which is the cause of their attribution to Valerius Cato, and the mention of a division of lands, which led to the Vergilian theory. In point of fact they were written not only by different men but at different epochs. The *Lydia* was probably by some young author of the Augustan age, the *Dirae* was evidently composed by some more illustrious poet.

4. A. Krause, *Miscellen zur Geschichte Alexanders*, discusses (1) the date of the battle of Gaugamela, making it Sept. 30 instead of Oct. 1; (2) the nationality of Alexander's phalanx, which was purely Macedonian up to the reform of Susa; (3) the division by the *ἰσασιστραί*, which he considers to be a triple one; (4) some details of the arming of Alexander's troops.

5. G. Kaibel, *Inschriften aus Pisidien*, gives an account of a few of the inscriptions lately brought to light in a journey through Asia Minor made by Dr. Sterrett, and published by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens—especially of the honorary decrees found at Anabura, in Pisidia.

6. H. van Herwarden, *Ad Diodori Siculi novissimam editionem quam recognovit F. Vogel*, 1888.

7. M. Wellman, *Zur Geschichte der Medicin im Alterthum*. (1) A discussion as to the date (placed about 100 B.C.) and merits of Herakleides of Tarentum, of whom all our knowledge is derived from scattered references in Galen, Celsus, etc. (2) On the often cited physician Andreas, who is identified with the physician of Ptolemy Philopator, murdered before the battle of Raphia in 217 B.C. (*conf.* Polyb. v. 81). (3) On the two physicians named Philonides. (4) On the distinction between Apollonius M. mentioned by Celsus (60 B.C.), and Apollonius of Kiton (end of 1st century B.C.).

8. K. P. Schulze, *Der Codex M. des Catull.* An account of the readings of the Codex M. at Venice (*Codex Venetus cartaceus*, No. 107, Class. xii. cod. lxxx.), which has been used in the Paduan edition of Catullus of 1755 by von Heyse in an appendix to his translation; and by R. Ellis in his 2nd ed. The MS. is of the 15th century, clearly written in semi-Gothic characters, and has annotations both in the margin and between the lines.

9. W. Wilcken, *Kaiserliche Tempelverwaltung in Aegypten*. The following results are gained:—

(1) It appears from a papyrus in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris that vacant priesthoods in Egypt were put up to auction by the procurators of the emperor, the proceeds going to the fiscus. This was one of the regal privileges passed on to the emperors. (2) From this papyrus, and also from two other inscriptions, it appears that the procurator was called *διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην*. This term *διαδεχόμενος* and *διάδοχος* appears from other papyri to be a technical term for those who stand next to or represent a higher officer. The procurators accordingly are the representatives in the various nomes of the *ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Αἰγύπτου πάσης* (C. I. Gr. 5900). Another papyrus proves that the *ἀρχιερεὺς* was himself a procurator, but of a higher grade. He seems to have corresponded with the sacerdotes of the other provinces, and to have superintended the Caesar-worship, though there was no provincial 'concilium' in Egypt. Wilcken believes that this centralisation of the Egyptian cultus was a creation of the principate, to neutralise the possibly dangerous influence of the local priesthoods. For this reason the central *ἀρχιερεὺς* was a procurator, and his sub-

ordinates and representatives belonged also to the immediate dependents of the emperors.

10. F. Spiro, *σύμπλοκοι ἀνάπαιστοι*.

11. E. Maas, *Mythische Kurznamen*. A discussion of such forms as Alkinoos—Alkimedon; Glauke—Glaukopis; Deukalos—Deukalion, etc., etc.

Miscellen. F. Blass, *Nachtrag zu S. 219* (on the Greek and Latin MSS. in the old Serail at Constantinople).—K. Krumbacher, *Zur Chronik des Theophrastos*.—U. Wilkchen, *Zu den Arsinoitischen Tempelrechnungen*.—Th. Mommsen, *das atrium Libertatis*. Jordan places the atrium Libertatis in the Campus Martius near the Temple of the Nymphs, on the ground that there is no site in the Forum which can have belonged to it. Mommsen shows from various passages of Cassiodorus and Inscriptions (C. I. L. VI. 1794 and 407), found in the Church of S. Adriano and S. Martina, that the atrium Libertatis formed part of the 'secretarium senatus,' formerly called the 'atrium Minervae.'

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen. June-October, 1888.

June. On Liv. 6, 7, 4, H. J. Müller inserts *ex* before *Aequis*. H. Genz reviews the late H. Jordan's *Die Könige im alten Italien* a fragment, in which the author endeavours to solve the problem of the contradiction between the plebeian names of the kings of Rome and the patrician mode of their election.

July—August. On Liv. 9, 12, 3, for *inclinatis viribus* H. J. Müller proposes *inelibatis* v. comparing 21, 29, 6 and 42, 30, 6. On 9, 24, 5, he proposes *considerare* for *insidere*, taking *silvestribus locis* as abl. and comparing I. 25, 4, where he would change *increpere* into *concrepere*. C. Wagener, *Hauptschwierigkeiten der lateinischen Formenlehre* (H. J. Müller), a most useful book, 'the present book is for accident what the "Antibarbarus" is for syntax, a book of reference where can be seen quickly and surely in what writer a form occurs, whether it is classical or not, and so on. Classical Latin prose is taken as the standard.' G. Autenrieth, *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten* (E. Eberhard). Since the fourth edition in 1883 many improvements have been made. Helbig's 'homerische Epos' has been used with advantage. Thus A. adopts H.'s interpretation of ἀμφικύπελλον, 'two-handled,' and distinguishes between ἡλεκτρος and ἡλεκτρον. For nautical terms A. uses Breusing's 'Nautik der Alten.' The forms δειδέκτο, δειδέχαται, -το, are no longer connected with δέχουμαι, but more correctly with δέκνυμαι, and δέχται, δέχονται appear under δέμαί, not δέω. κληίδες are explained as thole-pins, and not as benches for rowers. The book appeals to a wider circle than before. J. van Leeuwen jr. and M. B. Mendes da Costa, *Der Dialekt der homerischen Gedichte*, translated from the Dutch (same reviewer), 'may be heartily recommended to the young philologist, for no one who is engaged on Hom. will lay down the book without being much stimulated and profited by it.' E. Curtius, *Griechische Geschichte*, 1st vol. to the beginning of the Persian war, 6th edition. Ad. Holm, *Griechische Geschichte*, 1st vol. to the end of the 6th cent. B.C. (M. Hoffmann). C.'s 1st vol. is essentially the same as the last edition (1878), but some additions and alterations have been made, e.g. p. 24 on the difference between the Gk. dialects: the history of Athens has received additions from the discovery of a papyrus-fragment of Aristotle's 'Polity of the Athenians'; p. 513 the excavations at Olympia have given occasion to a further account of the Heraeum. There is an interesting appendix on the late excavations at Tiryns and Mycenae. Holm ap-

peals chiefly to readers who are already familiar with the subject, gives more detailed notes than C. with critical discussions and copious references to literature. As opposed to C., H. minimises the historical value of the legends, but in both works 'the productiveness of the Greek spirit in every field of art is exhibited in constant connexion with the political history.'

September. G. Curtius, *Griechische Schulgrammatik*, 18th edition by W. von Hartel (W. Gemoll). This edition is much shortened by the exclusion of forms peculiar to Hom. and Hdt. and it is brought up to the level of the most recent scholarship, while it is recognised that a school-book can only embody such results as are certain. The same editor has brought out *Abriss der Grammatik der homerischen und herodotischen Dialekte* in connexion with this last edition of Curtius, 'a reliable and complete book of reference for the scholar.'

October. W. Pütz, *Historische Darstellungen und Charakteristiken*, 1st vol. *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 3rd edition by Julius Asbach, 1st part *Der Orient und die Griechen*, 2nd part *Die Römer* (Max Hoffmann). This vol. consists of extracts from E. Meyer, Nissen, Ranke, Curtius, Mommsen, Peter, Lange, Ihne, Nitzsch and others. F. W. Schubert, *Atlas Antiquus Historisch-geographischer Schulatlas der alten Welt* (A. Kirchhoff), contains twenty-four maps to illustrate the history of antiquity from the time of ancient Egypt to that of the Roman empire.

Revue de Philologie, xii. 2. April—June, 1888.

O. Riemann contributes (1) a justification of some textual corrections introduced into his edition of Liv. 27—30, (2) p. Archia § 8, *Heracleae esse tum adscriptum negabis?* is an instance of *esse* as imperfect inf. (3) notes on two passages of the Phaedo; 63 A. the statement is not true; hemlock paralyses the motor-nerves and produces death by the arrest of the respiratory movements; this action would not be sensibly modified by the cerebral excitement conversation might produce; 118 A. *ἐκνήθη* denotes some feeble convulsive movements, and not merely, as Archer-Hind says, = 'he stirred.' (4) parallels to the remarkable subjunctive in e.g. Liv. 21, 41, 15, *nec Alpes aliae sunt quas dum superant comparari nova possint praesidia*. (5) Ar. Nub. 184, the change of scene here showed the court, and not the interior, of Socrates' house. (6) instances of *sed*=*nunc* vero, Cic. ad Q. fr. I. 1, 44, Liv. 30, 39, 23. (7) Cicero uses the locative as well as the ablative (and, not, as Madvig says, the ablative only, L.G. § 275) for the names of towns at the end of a letter. Instances of the usages with names other than those of towns. Other articles are L. Havet, *Plaut. Aul. 296 ff. 321 ff. 406 ff. 449 ff.* J. Nicole, fragments of Hesiod on an Egyptian papyrus. J. Loth announces his discovery at Quimper of a new MS. of the 13th century, and older therefore than any MS. before known, of Seneca de remediis fortuitorum. He gives text and apparatus. G. Doncieux on the personality of Lygdamus, Tibullus bk. iii. A. Gasc-Desfosses, note on *quisque* in Cicero's speeches. M. Bonnet justifies the MS. ultra as against the generally received *ultra* in Sen. Phoen. 366; conjectures *ne remissione* (for *démisionne*) in Sallust Orléans frag. 9, 14; and in Sen. Ep. 88, 17 would read *ex hoc nihil detraho* (for *desperabo*), *totum exspecto*. Among the reviews is one by F. de Saussure on King and Cookson's *Principles of sound and inflexion*—*Le livre est le fruit d'un travail consciencieux et digne de tout estime. Rarement en telle matière, on rencontrera une aussi sérieuse connaissance des questions pendantes etc.*

Philologischer Anzeiger, xvii. 8, 9, contains:—

86. W. Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur lateinischen paläographie* (P. Schwenke): 'Still the best for classical students.'—87. A. Fick, *Die ursprüngliche sprachform der hesiodischen Theogonie* (J. Menrad): Adverse to the main theory.—88. C. Walther, *Num quae imitationis Thucydidæ vestigia apud Demosthenem inveniri possint* (J. M. Stahl): 'Without principle or method.'—89. A. Zerdik, *Questiones Appianæ* (Loesch): 'Careful and thorough.'—90. A. Nauck, *Porphyrii opuscula* ed. 2. (Herm. Schrader): A detailed criticism mostly favourable.—91. C. A. Bapp, *De fontibus Athenaci* (L. Cohn): 'Stimulating and careful, but theory too complicated.'—92. F. F. Schulz, *Quibus ex fontibus fluverint Agidis, Cleomenis, Arati vitæ Plutarchæ* (Herm. Peter): 'An important contribution.'—93. R. Ellis, *Anecdota Oxoniensia* vol. I. part V.—94. J. Mähly, *Zur kritik lat. Texte*: Roughly handled.—92. G. Faltin, *Horazstudien*, I. *Ueber den zusammenhang des briefes an die Pisonen* (H.M.): 'Plausible, but needs elaboration.'—96. A. Lowinski, *Kritische Miscellen zu Horaz* (H.M.): Sarcastic.—97. Rob. Unger, *Electa e Ciris commentariis* (Karl Schenk): Favourable.—98. F. Plessis, *Propertiana* (R. Ehwald): Accepted with reservations.—99. O. Unrein, *De Aviani ætate* (O. Crusius): 'Careful and systematic.'—100. E. Ströbel, *Zur handschriftenkunde u. kritik von Ciceros Part. oratoriae* (W. Friedrich).—101. C. F. W. Mueller, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quæ manserunt omnia* p. II. vol. III. (Th. Stangl): Highly praised.—102. H. Jordan, *Questiones criticae*.—103. G. Egelhaaf, *Taciti Germania*.—104. M. Hertz, *A. Gellii noctes Atticæ* (M. Petschenig).—105. J. W. Beck, *De differentiarum scriptoribus latinis* (Guadermann): 'Inaccurate.'—106. Max Duncker, *Geschichte des alterthums* (L. Holzapfel): Favourable.—107. J. Teepfer, *Questiones Pisistratæ* (U): Commended.—108. A. Fokke, *Retlungen des Alkibiades. Zweiter Theil: der aufenthalt des Alk. in Sparta* (U): 'Hardly proves his point.'—109. C. Neumann, *Geschichte Roms während des verfalls der republik* II. (M. Zoeller): 'Good except in estimates of character.'—110. W. Soltan, *Prolegomena zu einer römischen chronologie* (U): Favourable.—111. G. Knaack, *Questiones Phaedonæ* (R. Hildebrandt): 'Thorough, but from the nature of the subject unfruitful.'

Excerpte.

xvii. 10, 11:—112, 113. F. Blass, *Hermeneutik u. kritik—Paläographie, buchwesen u. handschriftenkunde* (H. Landwehr): Favourable.—114. J. N. Madvig, *Opuscula academica*: 'Cannot be too strongly recommended.'—115. L. Lange, *Kleine schriften aus dem gebiete der class. alterthumswissenschaft* I. (Cr.):

Highly praised.—116. *Commentationes philologæ in honorem sodalitii philologorum Gryphiswaldensis secundum lustrum condentis*. 'Good.'—117. Hans Flach, *Peisistratos und seine literarische thätigkeit* (U): 'Not convincing.'—118. Pecz, *Beiträge zur vergleichenden tropik der poesie* I. (Hammer): 'Interesting.'—119. F. W. Schmidt, *Kritische studien zu den griech. dramatikern* III. (Cr.): 'Ingenious but wild.'—120. F. H. M. Blaydes, *Aristophanis Plutus* (O. Bachmann): 'Utterly untrustworthy.'—121. Castellani, *Le Rane di Aristofane tradotte in versi italiani* (O. Bachmann): 'Serves its purpose.'—122. D. Gregoras, *Kritische betrachtungen über das leben und die lehren des Hippokrates* (H. Kühlewein): 'Not critical or scientific.'—123. R. von Grot, *Ueber die in der hippokratischen schriftenammlung enthaltenen pharmakologischen kenntnisse* (do.): Commended.—124. F. Poschenrieder, *Die naturwissenschaftlichen schriften des Aristoteles in ihrem verhältnis zu den büchern der hippokratischen sammlung* (do.): 'Mostly valuable.'—125. Scheer, *Miscellanea critica* (do.): 'Contains points of usefulness.'—126. H. Bonitz, *Platonische studien* (H.M.): 'Praise superfluous.'—127. W. Resl, *Verhältniss der fünf ersten im platonischen symposion vorkommenden reden zur rede des Sokrates u. Alkibiades* (do.): 'Little new.'—128. R. Swoboda, *De Demosthenis quæ feruntur proœmiis* (W. Schmid): 'Partly successful.'—129. Hercher, *Arriani scripta minora*, ed. Eberhard (M. Erdmann): 'Much improved.'—130. O. Crusius, *Plutarchi de proverbis Alexandrinorum libellus ineditus* (C. Häberlin): Highly praised.—131. Heiberg and Menge, *Euclidis opera omnia* (H. Weissenborn).—132. Bothe, *Questiones Diodoræ mythographæ* (K. Seeliger): Disagrees.—133, 134. Schoendoerffer, *De genuina Catonis de agricultura libri forma* I.—Paulus Weise, *Questionum Catoniarum capita* V. (G. Ihm): Favourable.—135. C. G. Bruns, *Fontes juris Romani antiqui*, ed. Mommsen: 'Above criticism.'—136. Hildebrandt, *studien auf dem gebiete der römischen poesie u. metrik* I. *Vergils culex*. (—s): 'Main point an absurdity.'—137—141. O. Güthling, *Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica*.—W. Klcusek, *Vergili Maronis Aeneis*.—Sonntag, *Beiträge zur erklärung Vergilischer Elogen*.—G. Heidtmann, *Emendationen zu Vergils Aeneis buch I. und IV.*—R. Sabbadini, *Quæ libris III. et VII. Aeneidos cum universo poemate ratio intercedat disputatio* (C. Häberlin): The last-named commended.—152. G. Thilo and H. Hagen, *Servi grammatici qui feruntur in Vergili carmina commentarii* I. II. (do.): Praised.—143. O. Gruppe, *Die griechischen culte u. mythen* I. (K. Tümpel): Recognises merits without accepting conclusions.

Excerpte.

[The following address has been drawn up by Professors Nettleship and Sonnenschein and widely signed.]

CAROLO ERNESTIO GEORGES

VIRO DOCTISSIMO

S. P.

Gratulamur Tibi, Vir Doctissime, sexagesimum annum inveni vitæ philologice, qui duorum prope sæculorum decursu quasi Nestor philologorum industriae, doctrinae, iudicii nobilissimum exemplum iunioribus hominibus dedisti, simulque rectam viam

et rationem in re lexicographica monstravisti. Id scilicet laudamus in Lexico tuo Latino, multo labore, et adversa interdum valetudine condito, quod artem ita adhibuisti criticam, ut inter omnia huiusmodi opera linguae Latinae studiosis sit utilissimum.

Errat enim vehementer, si quis putat rem lexicographicam in colligendis tantum verbis et exemplis constare; quae ita poscit omnia philologiae subsidia, summam doctrinam et industriam sensu critico ac sagacitate coniunctam, ut nihil eam temptantibus deesse oporteat. Neque ignoramus multa Te habere scripta, quae partim nondum publici iuris facta sunt, partim in Diariis Philologicis hic illic protulisti; in

quibus inscitiam reprehendisti, falsa notasti, prava correxisti, industriam iuniorum excitavisti ac fovisti. Quae scripta, cum intra fines Lexici vix possint comprehendendi, speramus Te olim ita uno corpore prolaturum esse ut harum rerum studiosis adiumento sint; simul a Deo optamus ut multi tibi anni supersint operi philologico idonei, utque fructum studiorum plenissimum ipse percipias cum aliisque communices.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Dix* (C. M.) A First Latin Reader and Writer. Post 8vo. 136 pp. (Parallel Grammar Series). Sonnenschein. 1s.
- Carmina Lyrica sive Eclogae Poetarum Anglicorum* in numeros Horatianos a Variis VV. D.D. Conversae concinnante Iosepho Hirst Lupton. Globe 8vo. 56 pp. Macmillan and Co. 4s. 6d.
- Ctesias*. Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by J. Gilmore. 8vo. 212 pp. Macmillan. 8s. 6d.
- Homer's Iliad*. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by Walter Leaf. Vol. 2. Books xiii-xxiv. 8vo. 510 pp. Macmillan. 14s.
- Hoole* (Rev. C. H.) The Classical Element in the New Testament considered as a proof of its genuineness, with an appendix on the old authorities used in the formation of the Canon. 8vo. Macmillan and Co. 10s. 6d.
- Nepos*. Cornelius Nepos, with English Notes by Oscar Browning. 3rd edition, revised by William Ralph Inge. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 3s.
- Plato*. Phaedrus, Lysis, and Protagoras. New and literal translation, mainly from the text of Bekker,

- by J. Wright. 12mo. 260 pp. Golden Treasury Series. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
- Plato*. The Republic I-V., edited by T. H. Warren. Feap. 8vo. Macmillan and Co. 6s.
- The Republic of, translated into English with Introduction, Analysis, Marginal Analysis, and Index by B. Jowett. Third edition, revised and corrected throughout. 8vo. 231, 379 pp. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- Sonnenschein* (E. A.) A Latin Grammar for Schools, based on the principles and requirements of the Grammatical Society. Part I. Accidence (revised.) Post 8vo. 108 pp. Sonnenschein. 1s. 6d.
- Tunison* (J. S.), Master Virgil. The Author of the Aeneid as he seemed in the Middle Ages. A Series of Studies. 8vo. vii, 230 pp. Cincinnati. R. Clarke and Co.
- Wilkins* (A. S.) and *Strachan* (J.) Passages for translation from Greek and Latin. Crown 8vo. 256 pp. Macmillan. 5s.
- Xenophon's Hellenica*. Book II. Edited, with introduction and Notes, by Philip Sandford. 12mo. 74 pp. Sewed. Ponsonby. 2s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Amann* (R.) De Corippo priorum poetarum latinorum imitatore. II. 4to. 13 pp. (Progr. Oldenburg).
- Anspach* (E.) Die horazischen Oden des 1. Buches in Bezug auf Interpolation, Aufbau und Zeit ihrer Abfassung. I. 32 pp. (Progr. Cleve).
- Antonibon* (G.) Studi sull' Arte poetica di Q. Orazio Flacco. 8vo. 110 pp. Bassano. 3 lire.
- Arriani τῶν μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον* libri VII. fragmenta, e codice vaticano rescripto, nuper iteratis curis lecto, ed. Ric. Reitzenstein. 36 pp. 8vo. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk.
- Bellum Alexandrinum. Erklärt von Dr. R. Schneider. 8vo. viii, 65 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 90 Pf.
- Barwinsky* (B.) Quaestiones ad Dracontium et Orestis tragoediam pertinentes. 8vo. 15 pp. (Progr. Deutsch-Krone).
- Becher* (F.) Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Cälius. 4to. 43 pp. (Progr. Ilfeld).
- Cerrato* (L.) La tecnica composizione delle odi pindariche. 8vo. 142 pp. Genoa. 4 lire.
- Coblentz* (B.) De libelli *περί ὄψεως* auctore. 8vo. 76 pp. Strassburg. Heitz. 1 Mk. 50.
- Cornelius* (E.) Quomodo Tacitus, historiarum scrip-

- tor, in hominum memoria versatus sit usque ad renaescentes literas saeculis XIV. et XV. 43 pp. (Progr. Wetzlar).
- Dissertationes philologicae Halenses*. Vol. IX. 8vo. iii, 312 pp. Halle. Niemeyer. 8 Mk. (I-IX. 70 Mk.)
- Fabricius* (W.) Theophranes von Mytilene und Quintus Dellius als Quellen der Geographie des Strabon. 8vo. viii, 235 pp. With a map. Strassburg. Heitz. 4 Mk.
- Ferrai* (I.) I frammenti della Politica del Aristotele nel papiro clxxiii. del museo egizio di Berlino. 8vo. 10 pp. Padua.
- Ferrari* (S.) L'etica di Aristotele, riassunta, discussa ed illustrata. 16mo. vii, 426 pp. Turin. Paravia. 5 lire.
- Gübel* (G.) Horatianae prioris libri epistulae quibus temporibus compositae esse videantur. 12 pp. (Progr. Stettin).
- Gaddi* (L.) Le origini dello stato Romano; studio storico intorno al primitivo ordinamento politico di Roma. 8vo. 148 pp. Milan. Bellini. 2 lire.
- Gatti* (A.) Sopra i vocaboli italiani d'etimo greco; osservazione linguistiche. 8vo. 67 pp. Alessandria.

- Gemsa* (G.) Zur Reform der Textkritik des Cornelius Nepos. [On the Cod. Parcensis]. 30 pp. (Progr. Berlin).
- Genethliacon* Gottingense. Miscellanea philologica in honorem seminarii regii philologici Gottingensis scripserunt philologi Gottingenses XXIV. Roy. 8vo. vii, 188 pp. With 3 plates. Halle. Niemeyer, 7 Mk.
- Gnesotto* (F.) Orazio come uomo. 8vo. 92 pp. Padova.
- Gumpert* (F.) Argumentum satirae Horatianae II. 1 enarratur eiusque loci nonnulli difficiliore accurate explicantur. 32 pp. (Progr. Buxtehude).
- Harnecker* (O.) Adnotationes ad Ciceronis de oratore librum II. 18 pp. (Progr. Friedeberg).
- Hartel* (W. von). Curtius und Kaegi. 8vo. 59 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 70 Pf.
- Heimbold* (J.) Das Gastmahl des Nasidienus. Prosaische Uebersetzung von Hor. Sat. II. 8 nebst eingehenden Erklärungen. 36 pp. (Progr. Mülhausen).
- Hermes* (F.) Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Catull. Zur Lesbiafrage. 24 pp. (Progr. Frankfurt).
- Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores.* Ed. A. de Rossi. Vol. II. pars. 1. Folio. lxxviii, 586 pp. 6 plates. Rome. Cuggiani.
- Liesenberg* (Fr.) Die Sprache des Ammianus Marcellinus. I. 33 pp. (Progr. Blankenburg).
- Löwe*, Lexikalische Studien zu Ovid. 18 pp. (Progr. Strehlen).
- Löwy* (E.) Griechische Inschrifttexte. Für akademische Uebungen ausgewählt. Lex. 8vo. iv, 38 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 1 Mk.
- Macke* (R.) Die römischen Eigennamen bei Tacitus. II. Index. 20 pp. (Progr. Hadersleben).
- Mers* (A.) Kritik einiger Textstellen vom poetischen Standpunkte. 8vo. 32 pp. Riga. Bruhm. 60 Pf.
- Orsi* (P.) L' XI volume del Corpus Inscriptionum latinarum e la sua importanza per la storia della Romagna. 8vo. 19 pp. Bologna.
- Plato*. Dialoghi tradotti de R. Bonghi. Vol. IX. 12mo. clxxxiv, 273 pp. Rome. Bocca. 6 lire 50.
- Pöppelmann* (L.) Bemerkungen zu Dillenburgers Horausgabe letzter Hand. II. 14 pp. (Progr. Münster).
- Rayet* (O.) Études d'Archéologie et d'Art. Réunies et publiées avec une notice biographique sur l'auteur, par S. Reinach. 8vo. xvi, 463 pp. 5 full-page plates, and 112 cuts. Paris. Didot. 10 frcs.
- Reckzey* (A.) Ueber grammatische und rhetorische Stellung des Adjektivums bei den Annalisten, Cato und Sallust. 31 pp. (Progr. Berlin).
- Rosberg* (K.) Materialien zu einem Kommentar über die Orestis Tragoedia des Dracontius. 8vo. 64 pp. (Progr. Hildesheim).
- Rouze* (C.) Nouvelle grammaire classique de la langue latine. 12mo. Paris. E. Belin. 2 frcs.
- Ruggiero* (E.) Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane. Parts IV—VII. (Adp—Aed). 8vo. Rome. Pasqualucci. Each part 1 lire 50.
- Schild* (R.) Quibus in rebus Sallustius Thucydidem respexerit aut respexisse credatur. 16 pp. (Progr. Nordhausen).
- Schlag* (H.) Cicero, Verfasser einer grammatischen Schrift. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Wertbestimmung der grammatici latini. 16 pp. (Progr. Siegen).
- Schröter* (G.) Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Vergils Aeneis III. (8, 556; 9, 556; 11, 172). 4to. 13 pp. (Progr. Neisse).
- Schütte* (H.) Theorie der Sinnesempfindungen bei Lukrez. 25 pp. (Progr. Danzig).
- Schwarz* (P.) Tibullus als Schulschriftsteller. 20 pp. (Progr. Salzwedel).
- Sturm* (I.) Das kaiserliche Stadium auf dem Palatin. With a map. 8vo. 62 pp. Würzburg. Hertz. 1 Mk. 50.
- Susemihl* (F.) Analectorum Alexandrinorum chronologicorum Particula II. 4to. 29 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk. (I. et II. 3 Mk. 60 Pf.)
- Thucydides*. Guerra del Peloponneso tradotto in lingua armena dal padre Abr. Gjarian. 16mo. xi, 679 pp. Venice.
- Wallich*. Die Geschichtsschreibung des Tacitus. 32 pp. (Progr. Rendsburg).
- Wormstall* (J.) Ueber die Chamaver, Brukterer, und Angrivarier. Neue Studien zur Germania des Tacitus. 24 pp. (Progr. Münster).

END OF VOL. II.

INDEX.

Note.—In the General Index names of actual contributors, in the Index Locorum references to passages discussed, are printed in heavy type.

I.—GENERAL INDEX.¹

A.

- a** and **ei** confused in MSS., 244a.
a and **oi** confused in MSS., 245a.
-a, 'half-long' quantity of, 129b.
ā becomes **-o** in Oscan and Umbrian, *ib.*
a puppi venti, meaning of, 212a.
ā-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 129b. *ff.*
Abbott (Ev.), notice of Hdt. Bk. II., translated by 'B. R.', 250a. *f.*
Abbott (Ev., and Matheson, P. E.), *Demosthenes*, noticed, 207a. *ff.*
Abbott (T. K.), notice of Ceriani's *Recensionis dei LXX.*, 81b. *f.*
 old-Latin Biblical Texts, Parts I. II., 27b. *f.*
 the same, Part III., 312a. *ff.*
 note on Cic. (*Ep. Q. F. I. ii. 13*), 119a.
abecedaria, Italic, 146b.
ablatives, double (*rouvāthe*, &c.), 163b.
ablative endings in early Italian, 130b., 131a., 132b., 203b., 204b., 273b., 274a., 275a., 276b., 277a. *b.*
Abou-Symbol inscriptions, date of, 146a.
Abraham (J. H.), note on an epitaph found at Pholegandros, 325b.
 note on Virgil (*Aen. IX. 721*), 226a.
ac before **g** in Cic. ? 210b.
accedere with accusative, 27a.
accusative, Aeolic, 193a.
 endings of in early Italian, 130b., 131b., 132b., 203a. *f.*, 204b., 273b., 274a., 275a. *b.*, 276b., 277a. *b.*
 uses of, 213a.
 with *accedere*, 27a.
Achaea, alphabet of, 146b.
 federal instincts in, 251a.
 rise in political importance, *ib.*
Achelous, attributes of, 230b.
Acherontia (Acerenza), 16b., 17b.
Achilles, legend of, 133b. *f.*
actutum, corrupted in MSS., 71a.
ad aedem (i) in *aede*, 210b.
 'ad alis alium', 28a.
Adam (J.), *Platonis Crito* noticed, 175b.
adlectus inter praetorios, 214b.
admotus and *ammotus*, 20b.
Adonius, 70b.
Adramyttion, Gulf of, 97a.
Aegaeon, as a title of Poseidon, 288a.
Aenesidemus, 111a. *b.*, 112b.
 and Philo of Alexandria, 320b.
Aeolic alphabet, 146a.
 forms, 197b., 198a.
Aeschylus, Eumenides, ed. Sidgwick, 108ff.
 MSS. in British Museum, 172a.
 Prom. Vinct. ed. Glazebrook, noticed, 78a. *f.*
 See Warr (G. C.), 'Echoes of Hellas.'
Aetolia, federal instincts in, 251a.
 rise in political importance of, *ib.*
ἀγών ἐπιτάφιος instituted, 113b.
Αἰγύμιος, Hesiodic poem, 197a.
Αἰεΐας, scansion of, 101b.
ἀκολουθῶ, construction of, 317b.
ἀκταίνειν, meaning of, 291b.
Alcmaeonidae, 35a.
ἀλητεία corr. *λητεία*, 225a. *f.*
Alexander of Tralles, references to the fish ὀρφός in, 98a.
ἀλλὰ γάρ, 110b.
alphabet, Greek, 9b., 11b. *f.*, 35a.
 history of, 194a.
 Kirchhoff on, 145ff., 194a.
 of Achaea, 146b.
 Aeolic Asia Minor, 146a.
 Anatolia, 194b.
 Argos, 146b.
 Attica, 146a.
 Cephalenia, 146b.
 Corinth, 146a.
 Cyrene, *ib.*
 Hermione, &c., 146b.
 Ionic, 196a.
 Italy, 146b.
 Lycia, 194b.
 Megara, 146a.
 Naxos, *ib.*
 Pamphylia, 194b., 195b.
 Bergk on, *ib.*
 Phoenician, 12b.
 Rhodes, 146a., 196a.
 Sicyon, 146a.
 Thasos, 195b.
 alphabets, Greek, classification of, 194a.

¹ The Index is by H. D. Darbishire, Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge.

- Alpheus (Ruphias), 83a.
 Amazons, in mythology, 134a.
 ἀμύρτος in Apoll. Rhod., 84a.
 -āmi, is Skt. due to contamination, 163b.
 Ammon, in mythology, 134a.
 Amorgos, archaeology at, 123b.
 Amphiarus, sculptures of, 124a.
 ampulla, derivation of, 213b.
 Amsanti Lacus, 14a.
 ἀνδ, use of in Greek at different eras, 251b.
 analogy, a linguistic principle, 219b. f.
 Anatolian alphabet, 194b.
 ancestor-worship, 5a.
Anderson (W. C. F.), notice of
 Belger's *Beitr. z. Kenntniss d. griech. Kuppelgräber*, 57b.
 of Blümner's *Leben u. Sitten d. Griechen*, ib.
 of Brunn's *Beschr. d. Glyptothek u.s.w.*, 124b.
 of Sauer's *Die Anfänge d. statuar. Gruppe*, 231b. f.
 Angerona, in mythology, 309b.
 ἀνηιωβολία, 251b.
 ἀνέκλων corr. ἀνέικων, 261b., 292b.
 ἀνέρεσον ταῖς ψυχαῖς = animis refrizerunt, 80a.
 ἀνήρ, use of, 318a.
 anthemion of capitals, 265a.
 ἀντίδοσις, 246a.
 ἀντίποις, 109b.
 Antiphon, style and language of, 206b. ff.
 Antiquities, Roman, work on, 201ff.
 antiquities v. archaeology.
 ἀντοφθαλμείν, 251a.
 Antonines, age of, 170a.
 Antwerp, archaeology at, 157a.
 aorist indic., endings of, 164a.
 with μέ, 324b.
 Aphrodite, cult and eponyms of, 134a. ff.
 Homeric hymn to, 199a.
 origin of, 287b.
 temple of the Paphian, 155ff., 186ff.
 ἀφρόνη = ἀφροσύνη, 243a., 245b.
 ἀποβάλλειν, of involuntary loss, 207a.
 Apocalypse, old-Latin version of, 314b.
 apocryphianus, meaning of, 77b.
 apodosis to double condition, position of, 253a.
 ἀποικοί, 34a., 35a.
 ἀπογράφω, meaning of, 247b.
 Apollo, cult and eponyms of, 185a. f.
 Homeric hymn to, 199b. f.
 Apollonius Rhodius, genitives in, 13a. b.
 lexicography of, 83a. ff.
 Apostolides B., *Essai...Inscr....Lemnos*, noticed, 232a.
 ἀπρόσκοπος, 109b.
 Apulia, 13ff.
 Aramaic, use of in Judaea, 142b. ff.
 arbitrators, public, in Athens, 246a.
 Archaeological Schools at Athens, 43ff.
 Archaeology, notes and summaries, 50ff., 90ff., 119ff., 153ff., 186ff., 230ff., 264ff., 296ff., 327ff.
 Archaic inscriptions from Crete, 9ff.
 ἀρχιδεαυρός, 156b., 186a.
 ἀρχήν = omnino, 79a.
 architecture, ancient, 264a. ff.
 Roman, 297a.
 archonship at Athens, 241a. b., 290a. b.
 Arcus Didymus, 105b.
 Ares in the brazen pot, 222a.
 Argos, alphabet of, 146b.
 ἀργυροθεΐσαι πρόσωπα, 180a.
 argutus, 213a.
 Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, ed. Blaydes, 317a. ff.
 MSS. in Brit. Mus., 173b. f.
Nubes, ed. Teuffel-Kaehler, 205a.
 Aristophanes, *continued*—
Plutus, ed. Blaydes, 317a. ff.
 and the gold coinage of Athens, 231a.
 Aristotle, cross-references in, 305b. f.
De Anima, II. III., constitution of, 307a.
Physics VII., duplicate version of, 306b.
Politics, ed. Newman, reviewed, 104ff.
 constitution of, 307a. f.
 'imperfect virtue' in, 106b.
 and monarchy, 107b.
 on position of women among barbarians, 106b. f.
 order of books in, 105a. ff.
 value of *vetus interpretatio*, 106a. f.
 Shute's history of his writings, 305a. f.
 [Aristotle], *De Mundo* and Nicolaus Damascenus, 305a.
 Aristoxenus on Greek metre, 221a. f.
 on singing and speaking, 221a.
 Arnim, H. von, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria*, noticed, 320b. f.
 ἄργυ, Egyptian parallel to ἄρκος, 4a.
 argui species, 212a.
 Artemis, 135b.
 artubus, pronunciation of, 282a.
 Asclepius, 136a.
 Asmus (R.), *Quaestiones Epicteteas*, noticed, 321a.
 aspiration, lost in Greek, 162a.
 preserved by accent, ib.
 assimilation in Cretan, 10a.
 Assos, Amer. Arch. Inst. at, 97a. f.
 Astarte, 136a.
 asynartete verses, 221b.
 Ate, in mythology, 136b.
 Athenaeus, ed. Kaibel II., noticed, 80a.
 Athens, cult and eponyms of, 136b. f.
 Athenian empire, administration of, 255a.
 'Athenodotus' vases, 234b., 235a.
 Athens, archaeology at, 53a., 90b., 88a. ff., 123b.
 coinage of, 231a. f.
 Atlantis = Callisto, 180b. f.
 ἄτοπον, 176a.
 'Ατρεΐδew corr. 'Ατρεΐδα', 100a. f.
 Attic law, 245a. f.
 Attica, alphabet of, 146a.
 archaeology in, 123b.
 attraction in Latin, 178a.
 auctor secundus in Attic law, 247b.
 augment of ἐργάζομαι, 292b.
 of verbs in ἐν-, 317b.
 omitted in Homer, 174b.
 Augustine, S., 'Speculum' of, 82a.
 αὐτός corr. ἀστός, 324a.
 αὐθέντης, meaning of, 207a.
 Axos, inscription at, 11b.

B.

- Bacon's 'Vinum Daemonum,' illustrated, 226b.
 Bali, legend of, 322a.
 Barnabas, Epist. relation to Didache, 284a., 285a. ff.
 Battifol-Hyvernat, *Didascalia cecxviii. Patrum Pseud-epigrapha*, noticed, 81a.
 Baumeister, *Denkmäler d. Klassischen Altertums*, Vols. II. III. noticed, 330a. f.
 Baunack (J. and T.), *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, noticed, 9f.
 Belger (G.), *Beiträge zur Kenntniss d. griech. Kuppelgräber*, noticed, 57b.
 Bell (A. M.), *Caesar Bell. Gall. I.*, noticed, 209b. f.
 Bellerophon and Pegasus monument, 137b.
 Bent (J. T.), notes from Telmessos, 234b.
 on museum at Constantinople, 329a.

- Bent (J. T.), *continued*—
on Sirina, *ib.*
on towns mentioned by Ptolemaeus, 189a.
Bernard (E. R.) and Prichard, *Select Letters of Pliny*, noticed, 214a. f.
Bible, codices of I. Kings, 82a.
Bibliography, 61a. ff., 96a. f., 128a. f., 160a. f., 191a. ff., 240a. f., 270a. ff., 303a. ff., 335a. ff.
Bie (O.), *Die Museen in der antiken Kunst*, noticed, 188a.
Bigg (C.), notice of von Arnim's *Philo von Alexandria*, 320b. f.
Bion, genitives in, 13b.
Birt's articles in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed (Ceres, Dea Dia, Diana, Genius), 311a. f.
Bitschowsky (R.), *Krit. exeget. Studien zu d. scriptores historiae Augustae*, noticed, 289b.
Blass (F.), *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, ed. 2, noticed, 80a.
Blaydes (F. H. M.), *Aristophanis Acharnenses*, noticed, 317b. f.
Aristophanis Plutus, noticed, 317a. f.
Blümner, *Leben u. Sitten d. Griechen*, noticed, 57b.
Blunt (H. W.), *Decline of the Roman Commonwealth*, noticed, 217a. f.
Bologna, Greek Ode for Centenary at, 257ff.
Boor (C. de), *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, noticed, 29a. f.
Borgeaud (C.), *Le Plébiscite dans l'Antiquité I.*, noticed, 216a. f.
bos, contrary to Latin phonetic law, 274b.
declension of, 274a. f.
βουλεύω = 'resolve' with dependent infin., 78b.
βουλῆτος, note on, 260a. ff., cf. 291a. f.
Bowen (Lord Justice), *Virgil in English Verse*, reviewed, 66ff.
British Museum, acquisitions of, 232a. f., 266a. f., 297a. f., 329b. f.
archaeology in, 52a., 90b., 232a. f., 265b. ff., 297a. f.
Brochard (V.), *Les Septiques Grecs*, reviewed, 111ff.
Brodrick (W. J.), notice of *Plutarch, Nikias*, ed. Holden, 208a. f.
Bruckmann (Fr.) v. Brunn (H.),
Brunn (H.), *Beschreibung der Glyptothek König Ludwigs I.*, noticed, 124b. f.
Denkmäler griech. u. röm. Sculptur, ed. Bruckmann, noticed, 188a.
Bücheler (F.) and Zitelmann (E.), *Das Recht von Gortyn*, noticed, 9f.
Bulgarians in history, 209b.
Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition, 189a.
catalogue of do. noticed, 297b.
Burmah, legends of, 322a. b.
Burn (R.), *Roman Literature in Relation to Roman Art*, noticed, 296a. ff.
Bury (Jane), note on *diepós*, 179a. f.
Bury (J. B.), note on Aeschylus (*Ag.* 555-7), 324a.
on *ἐπίπτος* &c., 42b.
on Sophocles (*Ant.* 782-9), 224a.
(commented on, 261b. f.).
on *stritauos*, 43a. f.
notice of de Boor's *Theophylacti Simocattae Hist.*, 29a. f.
of Capes' Polybius, 250b. ff.
of Comment. Phil. Gryphius, 321a.
of Kaibel's *Athenaeus*, 80a.
of Sotiriadis' *Zur Kritik des Johannes von Antiochia*, 208b. ff.
Busolt, *Die Griech. Altertümer I. Staats- u. Rechtsaltertümer* (in Müller, *Handb.* vol. vi.), 33ff.
Butcher (S. H.), notice of Abbott-Matheson's *Demosthenes*, 207a. f.
notice of Cucuel's *Essai sur la Langue et le Style d'Antiphon*, 206b. f.
Butcher (S. H.), on *μή* with fut. indic., 322b. f.
Byrne (J.), *Origin of the Greek, Latin, and Gothic roots*, noticed, 220a. f.
Bywater (I.), notice of Usener's *Epicurea*, 278a. ff.
Bywater (I.), *Priscianus Lydus*, reviewed, 17ff.
Byzantine Greek, 209a.
historians, 208b. f.
C.
Caesar, *De Bello Gallico I.*, ed. Bell, noticed, 209b. f.
[Caesar] and Suetonius, 326a.
Calamis, statues of, 134a., 135b.
Callimachus, genitives in, 13a.
Callisto, legends and eponyms of, 180b. f.
Cambodia, legend of, 322a.
Cambridge, classics at, 148a.
Campbell (L.), review of Brochard's *Septiques Grecs*, 111ff.
notice of Schneidewin-Nauack's *Sophocles: Aias, Philoctetes*, 249a. f.
Campbell (L.), *Leptodendron Septentrionale*, noticed, 321a. f.
Canens, in mythology, 309b.
Capes (W. W.), *Polybius, History of the Achacan League*, noticed, 250b. ff.
Carina, in mythology, 309b.
Carneades, 111b., 112a. b.
Carter (F.), notice of Sidgwick's *Vergil, Eclogues*, 212a. f.
Case (T.), on the chronology of the Solonian legislation, 241f.
(commented on, 290a. ff.)
Casina corr. *Canisa* (?), 22b.
Castelforte, archaeology at, 59a.
Catullus, *Hermes Beiträge zu.*, noticed, 178b.
ed. Schmidt, reviewed, 70f.
Cavallari-Holm, *Topographia*, &c. v. Lupus (B.)
Celebes, custom of, 261b.
Cercops of Miletus, edits Hesiod, 197a.
Ceriani, *Le Recensionis dei LXX*, &c., noticed, 81b.
Ceres, 311b.
cernua, L. Lat., 99a. b.
ch, in Church Slavic, 219b.
*χαλξ, a bronze coin, 80a.
χαράδριος, χαράδριον, 225b.
Charis Auxo, 138b.
Charites, in mythology, 138a. f.
Cheetham (S.), on *βουλῆτος*, 291a. f.
Chester, archaeology at, 53b., 90b.
χαρουργία ἡ, used by Strabo, 84b.
Christodorus, genitives in, 13a.
Chryse, legend of, 123a. f.
Church (A. J.), notice of Blunt's *Causes of the Decline of Roman Commonwealth*, 217a. f.
ciboria, 73a.
Cicero, construction of *cum* in, 210b.
nubere in, *ib.*
proper names in, *ib.*
Merguet's *Lexicon zu den philosoph. Schriften* I. II., noticed, 211b. f.
Pro Caelio, ed. Vollgraff, noticed, 211a. f.
Pro Plancio, ed. Kopke-Landgraf, noticed, 252b. f.
quocum in, 110b.
textual criticism of, 211a.
Tusculans, ed. Schiche, noticed, 210b. f.
Verrines IV., ed. Thomas, noticed, 210b. f.
use of *ac* before *g*, 210b.
Cirencester, Richard of, 147b.
Clarke (J. T.), note on the fish *ὀρέφός*, 97ff.
notice of Puchstein's *Das Ionische Capitell*, 264a. ff.
z 2

- Classical education in France, 45ff.
in Germany, 86ff., 150ff., 182ff., 292ff.
MSS., Catalogue of, 102ff., 171ff.
(v. *sub* Manuscripts.)
Classica, school introduction to, 253b. f.
study of, 73b. f., 117, 148a. f., 229.
Claudianus Mamertus, ed. Engelbrecht, reviewed,
19a. f.
influenced by Fronto and Apuleius, 19b.
latinity of, *ib.*
relation to Sidonius Apollinaris, *ib.*
Cnossus, vase from, 232a.
coins attached to face, 180a., 261a. f.
Coluthus, genitives in, 13a.
comitia tributa) (concilia plebis, 216b.
Comment. Philol. Gryphiscald., noticed, 321a.
communis sensus) (sensus communis, 253a.
comparative mythology, 2b. f., 5b.
Comparetti (D.), *Leggi antiche della città di Gortyna*,
reviewed, 9ff.
compellare nero, 85a., 226a.
compositions, Greek verse, 36f., 257ff.
noticed, 321a. f.
computation by λέξεις and τριπόδες, 11a.
Conington's translation of Vergil, 67a.
Consentes, in mythology, 309b.
consonants, ideas conveyed by, 220b.
consonant-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b.
Constantinian excerpts, *περί γυναικῶν*, 209a.
Constantinople, archaeology at, 123b.
construction διὰ μέσων, 140b. f.
Consus, in mythology, 309b.
Conway (R. S.), *Verner's Law in Italy*, noticed,
218b. f.
Cook (A. M.), note on Cic. *Acad.* (2, 5), 39b.
note on Sall. *Jug.* (53, 5), *ib.*
notice of works on Sallust, 25a. ff.
Cooke (A. H.), notice of Curtius' *Griechische Gesch.*
I^a, 34a. ff.
II^a, 254b. f.
Cookson (C.), note on *provincia*, 227b. f.
notice of Wheeler's *Analogy*, &c., 219b. f.
Corinthian alphabet, 146a.
Cornell University v. Wheeler (B. J.).
Corp. Script. Eccl. Latin, noticed, 19ff.
Crete, archaic inscr. from, 9ff.
Croiset (A. and M.), *Hist. de la Littérature Grecque I.*,
noticed, 255b. f.
Cron (Chr.), *Platonis Apologia u. Kriton*, noticed,
175b.
Cueuel (C.), *Essai sur la Langue d'Antiphon*, noticed,
206b. f.
on Plato's *Cratylus*, noticed, 205b. f.
cults, conservatism of, 287b.
Gruppe on, 1ff.
Greek, 133ff., 164ff.
Roman, 307ff.
cum, constr. of in Cic., 210b.
Curtius (E.), *Griech. Gesch.* I^a, noticed, 34a. ff.
II^a, noticed, 254b. f.
Curtius (G.), *Griech. Schulgram.*, ed. 18 (Hartel),
noticed, 218b.
'cyclic' dactyl, 221a. f.
Cyme, archaeology at, 24a.
terra-cottas from, 122a.
Cypria, relation to Homeric hymns, 199a. b.
Cyprian dialect, 199a.
origin of Homeric hymns to Aphrodite, *ib.*
Cypriote inscriptions, 156b., 187a. b.
Cyprus, archaeology, 53b., 90b., 124a.
excavations in, 155ff., 186ff.
Cyrene, alphabet of, 146a.
Cyzicus, coinage of, 230a. b.
- D.
-d lost in Latin, 130b., 203b., 273b.
dactyl, value of, 221a. b.
a unit of measurement, 264b. f.
Damasias archon, 35a., 240a. f.
Damia, in mythology, 310b.
'Daniel's Servius,' 82a.
dative, Greek, 107a.
in -i elided, 250a.
plural in Homer, 175a.
in -ois, -aus, not Aeolic, 198a.
in -ois, -ησι, older Ionic, 199b.
endings of in early Italian, 130a. ff., 203a. ff.,
273a. ff.
Dea Dia, 311a.
declension, early Italian, 129ff., 202ff., 273ff.
δεῖδω = δεῖδω, 65a.
Delphi, temple at, 328a. f.
Demeter, hymn to, 199b.
democratical government, 216a. f.
demonologist myth-theory, 4b., 6b.
Demosthenes, ed. Abbott-Matheson, noticed, 207a.
portraits of, 32b. f., 149a.
dental-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b. f.
διὰ μέσων construction, 140b., 141a.
Diana, derivation of, 311a.
cult &c. of, *ib.*
statue of, 234a.
Didache, author acquainted with Gospels of Matthew
and Luke, 286a. ff.
eucharistic prayers in, 287a.
Johns Hopkins edition (J. Rendel Harris), noticed,
283a. ff.
notes on, 262b. f.
parallels from the *Didascalia*, 81b.
relation of to Hermas' *Shepherd* and *Epistle of*
Barnabas, 284a. ff.
and Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 287a.
theology of, 283b.
titles, and date of, 285b. f.
Wohlenberg on, noticed, 286a. ff.
Didascalia (Battifol's), noticed, 81a. f.
parallels from the *Didache*, 81b.
διερός, note on, 179a. f.
digamma, in Homer, 174a.
symbol for in Pamphyl., 195a.
δίκαι, various kinds of, 246a. b.
δικασταί, number of, 255a.
δικαστήρια, rise of at Athens, *ib.*
Dimsdale (M. S.), *Livy* xxi. noticed, 214a.
Dio Cassius and Johannes of Antioch, 209a.
Diogenes Laertius, textual criticism of, 278a. ff.
Dionysus, 164ff.
Dioscuri, 166a.
diphthongs, resolution of in Homer, 174a. f.
diurnalis = 'acre,' 261a.
Dius Fidius, 309b.
docimasia, kinds of, 246b.
δοξάζω, N.T., Latin equivalents for, 313b.
domus, decl. of, 273a., 274a.
Dowdall (L.), on *καθεύετε τὸ λοιπὸν*, 325a.
Dräger (A.), *Die Annalen des Tacitus*, ed. 5, noticed,
26b.
dum, with pres. indic., 213a.
durare, transitive, *ib.*
δυσφρόνη = δυσφροσύνη, 242a. f.
- E.
e-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 131b. ff.
ε, symbol for, at Sicyon, 196a.
early coinage in Greece, 11a., 34b., 35a.

- editorial, 241.
 Edwards (G. M.), Homer, *Odyssey* ix., noticed, 175b.
 Eggestaena, non-Hellenic, 180a.
 Egypt, archaeology in, 91a.
 religion of, 250b.
 Eichhorn's theory of the Gospels, 144a.
 Eileithia, representation of, 325b.
ἐκπύρασις, note on, 263a.
 electrum coinage, Cyzicus, 230a. f.
 Eleutherna, inscr. at, 11b.
 Elis, archaeology at, 124a.
 elision of genitives in -*oio*, -*ao*, -*io*, 12a., 99a. ff., 149a.
 Ellicott (C. J.), *St. Paul's First Epist. Corinth.*, noticed, 115b.
Ellis (R.), note on Catullus (xxii. 12), 85a.
 notice of Hermes, *Beiträge zu Catull.*, 178b.
 of Schmidt's *Catullus*, 70ff.
 Ellis (R.), *Orientis Carmina*, noticed, 19ff.
 Engelbrecht (A.), *Claudiani Mamerti Opera*, noticed, 19a. f.
 on the Latinity of Claudianus Mam., noticed, 19b.
England (E. B.), notice of Glazebrook's *Aeschylus*, *Prom. Vinc.*, 78a. f.
 of Paley's *Suppliant Women* of Euripides, 318a. f.
ἐννυχέω, 224a., 262a.
ἐνθα μή with subjunct. and with opt., 76a.
 epianalepsia, 85a., 226a.
ἐπαναπαῖς illustrated, 263a.
ἐκπύρασις, use of, *ib.*
 Ephesus terra-cottas, 120a. f., 235a.
 Ephetae, 35a.
 Epic poetry, 12ff., 99ff., 196f.
 originally strophic, 198.
 epics, growth of, 255b.
 Epictetus, work on, noticed, 321a.
 Epicurus, fragments of, 278a. ff.
ἐπιτιμάω, N. T., Latin renderings of, 313b.
ἐπιτρίτος &c., note on, 42b.
 Epona, 310b. f.
εἰρημ, pronunciation of, 281b.
ἐρεθίζω, 224b.
 Eriny, ethical value of, discussed, 108f.
erit, not in archaic Latin, 66a.
 Ernault (Kiepert), *Manuel de Géographie Ancienne*, noticed, 83b.
 Eros, in mythology, 166a.
 head of, discovered, 156b., 186a. b.
 Erymanthis = Atlantis, 180b. f.
 Essen (M. H. N. von), *Index Thucydideus*, noticed, 115a.
εσθι εσθις &c., 65b.
ἐθέλειν (*βούλεσθαι*), 114a.
ἐθέλωμι, Homeric, 163b.
ἐθώκατι, Hesych., 66b., 164b.
 Etruscan mirror, 329b.
Εὐβουλεύς, epithet of Hades, 167a.
εὐκλος, fem. of in Ap. Rhod. 84a.
εὐφρόνη = *εὐφροσύνη*, 243a., 244a.
 = *νύξ*, *ib.*
 Euripides, genitives in, 101b.
 Heracleidae, metre of, 31b.
 Ion, and the sculptures at Delphi, 328a. f.
 MSS. of, in Brit. Mus., 172b. f.
 new fragment of, 42a.
 Phoenissae, vase illustrating, 327b. f.
 Supplices, ed. Paley, noticed, 318a. f.
 Eussner (A.), *Sallust* (text), noticed, 25f.
εὐθυνα, 247b.
ἐξωτερικοί λόγοι, 305b.
- F.
- f and s confused in MSS., 28a.
 Fabiani on LXX. MSS., 208a.
- Faliscan declension, 129ff., 202ff., 273ff.
Farnell (L. R.), note on Pausanias (vii. 25. 8), 325a. f.
 notice of Mayer's *Die Giganten und Titanen*, 288a. f.
 of Roscher's *Lexicon der Mythol.* (Greek Articles), 133ff., 164ff.
 Faunus, 310a.
Fausset (W. Y.), notice of Landgraf-Köpke's *Cicero Pro Plancio*, 252a. f.
 (commented on, 291a.).
 replies to comments, 291a.
 federal institutions, origin of, 251a. f.
 Ferentina, 311b.
 Feronia, *ib.*
 Fick (A.), *Hesiod's Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung*, noticed, 196ff.
 Sprachform u.s.w. d. hesiodischen Theogonie, noticed, *ib.*
 Sprachform u.s.w. d. homerischen Hymnen, noticed, *ib.*
 Fierville (Ch.), *Une Grammaire Latine Inédite du xiii. siècle*, noticed, 214b. f.
 Flamen Dialis, bedstead of, 322b.
 Fleischer on Achilles, noticed, 133b. f.
 Flora, 311b. f.
 France, classical education in (IV.), 45f.
Fraser (J. G.), note on Ares in the brazen pot (E. 385ff.), 222a. f.
 on bedstead of Flamen Dialis, 322b.
 on *βουλευτός*, 260a. ff.
 (commented on, 291a. f.)
 on Hide-measured Lands, 322a. f.
 Freeman on Boniface and Aetius, criticised, 209b.
 French feminines from Lat. masculines in -or, 220a.
 Fortuna, in mythology, 310b.
Fowler (W. W.), note on Cic. *Ep.* (Q. Fr. II. 3, 5), 40a.
 notice of Müller-Voigt's *Römischen Alterthümer*, 201f.
 notice of Roscher's *Lexicon der Mythologie* (Roman articles), 307ff.
Furneaux (H.), notice of Draeger's *Tacitus Annalen*, I^o, 26b.
 Furtwängler's articles in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed (Aphrodite, Apollo, Athene, Charites), 134b. ff.
 (Dioscuri), 166a.
 future indic. with *μή*, 322b. ff.
- G.
- γάρ, not elliptical, 110b.
 Gardner (E. A.), on Naucratis inscr., 146a.
 Gellius on decl. of *e*-stems in Latin, 132a.
 Gemoll on the Homeric hymns, 198b. ff.
 Genucian law, 217b.
 gender, change of, analogical, 220a.
 'generic' clauses, *μή* in, 323a.
 and 'indefinite' relatives, 110a.
 genitive, endings of in early Italian, 130a., 131a., 132a. b., 202b., 204a. f., 273a., 274a. b., 275a., 276a., 277a. b.
 in Homer and the epic and lyric poets, 12ff., 99ff.
 of monosyllables, 101a.
 Genius, in mythology, 311a.
γένος, *κώμη*, as social unit, 107a.
genus, meaning of, 253a.
 geography, Greek, 82b. f.
 Georges (C. E.), address to, 334f.
 Germany, classical education in, 86ff., 150ff., 182ff., 202ff.
γερουσία, Spartan, 34a. b.

- Gerth (B.), *Kurzgef. griech. Schulgram.*, noticed, 218b.
 giants &c., in mythology, 166a., 288a.
 Gitlbauer (M.), *Philol. Streifzüge*, noticed, 30b. ff.
 Glazebrook (M.), *Aeschylus, Prom. Vinc.*, noticed, 78a. f.
 Gleditsch (H.) v. Westphal (R.),
 glosses, corruption from, 31b., 291b. f.
 Gomme (G. L.), *Romano-British Remains II. (Gentleman's Mag. Library)*, noticed, 146a. ff.
Goodhart (H. C.), notes on Tacitus (*Agric. i.*), 226b. f.
 (*Ann. ii. 23*), 227a.
 Goodwin on $\mu\eta$ with fut. indic., 322b. f.
 Gortyn inscription, 9a. ff., 146a.
 Gow (J.), *Companion to School Classics*, noticed, 253b. f.
 Gracchi, dates of the, 37b. f.
 grammar, Greek, works on, noticed, 218a. f.
 Latin, 215b. f., 279a. ff.
Grammatici graeci, edition announced, 181b.
Graves (C. E.), notice of Essen's *Index Thucydideus*, 115a.
γρῶναι, kinds of, 246a. ff.
 Greenwell (W.), *The Electrum Coinage of Cyzicus*, noticed, 230a. f.
 Greece, geography of, 82b. f.
 oriental influence on, 4a., 7b., 8b.
 Greek alphabet, 9b., 11b. f., 35a., 145a. ff., 194a. ff.
 cults and mytha, work on, noticed, 1ff., 133ff., 164ff.
 law, ancient code of, 10a. f.
 metre, 221a. f.
 Modern, 179b.
 scepticism, 111ff.
 temple, 10b.
 use of in Palestine, 142ff.
 verse, 36f., 257ff.
 see Campbell.
 Gruppe (O.), *Die Griech. culten u. Mythen. u.s.w. I.*, noticed, 1ff.
 Grimm's theory of mytha, 1b., 2a.
 guttural-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b. f.
- H.
- Habel (P.), *De Pontif. Roman. ctt.*, noticed, 288b. f.
habere, meanings of, 253a.
 Hades, 166b.
 Hager (H.), notice of Busolt, *Griech. Altertümer I.*, 33f.
 notice of Meier-Schömann, *Der Attische Process* (ed. Lipsius), 245f.
ἁλεις (Theocr. VII.) localised, 265b.
 Halmahera, custom of, 222a.
Hardy (E. G.), notice of Bitschowsky, *Krit. Exeget. Stud. z. d. scriptores historiae Augustae*, 289b.
 notice of Habel, *De Pontif. Roman. ctt.*, 288b. f.
 of Inge's *Society in Rome under the Caesars*, 289a. f.
 of Prichard-Bernard, *Select Letters of Pliny*, 214a. f.
 Vigié [Marquardt], *De l'Organisation Financière chez les Romains*, 216b. f.
ἡραρα = 'ties,' Delphic, 198a.
Harris (J. Rendel), notice of Loof's *Leontius von Byzanz*, 76 ff.
 edition of the *Didache* noticed, 283ff.
 on the Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament, noticed, 252a.
Harrison (Jane E.), note on newly-discovered vases, 234b. f.
- Hartel (W. von), *Abriss d. Grammatik d. hom. u. herod. Dialekts*, noticed, 218b.
 Curtius, *Griechische Schulgrammatik* (18 ed.), noticed, *ib.*
 Hartel's view of the digamma in Epic, 174a.
Haverfield (F.), notes on Aristophanes (*Aves*, 194-5), 324b.
 Lactantius and Orientius, 263b.
 new fragment of Euripides, 42a.
 new fragment of Sophocles, 324b.
 notice of Gomme's *Romano-British Remains II. (Gent. Mag. Libr.)*, 146b. ff.
 Lindsay's *Plautus Captivi*, 177b.
 Lupus, *Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum* (= Cavallari-Holm's *Topographia di Siracusa*), 215b. f.
 reply to Heitland's criticisms, 216a.
 summary of *Archiv. f. Lat. Lex. V. 1*, with comments, 159a.
 Hauler (E.), *Die Orléaner Palimpsestfragmente zu Sallust's Historien*, noticed, 25a. ff.
 Hawara, antiquities from, 266b, 297a.
 Head (B. V.), *Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Greek Coins—Attica*, &c., noticed, 231a. f.
ἑαυτοῦ γερύθαι, 207a. f.
ἑαυτοῦ as feminine, 319b.
Heberden (C.), notice of Westphal-Gleditsch, *Allgemeine Theorie d. griech. Metrik*, 221a. f.
ἑσπῆαις (ἑσπῆαισιν), 144b.
 Heitland's criticisms of Haverfield's *Model of Syracuse* replied to, 216a.
ἑκαστοι (ἑκαστος), 207b.
 Hekate, 167a. f.
 hellastic courts, 246a.
 Hellenistic Greek, 209a. f., 251a.
**ἡμα*, 'seat,' 324a.
 Hephaestion on *μέτρα πολυσχημίστα*, 221b.
ἔπομαι, construction of, 317b.
 Hermas, *Pastor*, ed. Hilgenfeld, noticed, 252a. f.
 relation of to the *Didache*, 284a. f.
 Hermes, Homeric hymn to, 199b.
 Hermes (Fr.), *Beitr. z. kritik u. erklär. des Catull.*, noticed, 178b.
 Hermocopidae, affair of, 255a.
 Herodotus, Bk. II. translated by 'B. R.' noticed, 250a. f.
 Bk. VIII. ed. Sitzler, noticed, 79a.
 The Ionic Revolt, ed. Stone, noticed, *ib.*
 dialect of, 79b.
 Lang on the good faith of, 250b.
 Herzog (E.), *Geschichte u. System d. röm. Staatsverfassung II. 1*, noticed, 168ff.
 Hesiod, Fick's works on, noticed, 196ff.
 genitive in, 102a. f.
 MSS. of catalogued, 171a.
 Hesiodic poems, dates of, 102b., 197a. f.
 hiatus in Polybius, 319a.
hic, as an article, 41b. f.
hic esto, correl. to *istic sum*, 41b.
Hicks (E. L.), note on a metrical inscription from Lagina, 289a. ff.
 on restoration of a metrical inscr., 118a.
 on the Telmessian inscr., 234b.
Hicks (R. D.), notice of Bywater's *Priscianus Lydus*, 17f.
 notice of Cucuel on Plato's *Cratylus*, 205b. f.
 notice of Joel's *Plato's geistige Entwicklung*, u.s.w., 206b.
 notice of Shute's *History of the Aristotelian Writings*, 305a. ff.
 hides as a measurement of land, 322a. f.
ἱσπάραια, note on, 262b. f.
 Hilgenfeld (A.), *Hermas Pastor Graece*, noticed, 252a. f.

- hinc*, use of, 41a. *f.*
 hire of slaves in Greece, 33b.
Hogarth (D. G.), on excavations in Cyprus, 155ff., 186ff.
Holden (H. A.), replies to criticisms on his *Pro Plancio*, 291a. (*cf.* 253a).
Plutarch's Life of Nikias, noticed, 208a. *f.*
 Holub (J.), *Sophocles Antigone*, noticed, 249b. *f.*
 Homer, *Iliad*, ed. van Leeuwen—da Costa, noticed, 174a. *f.*
Odyssey IX. ed. Edwards, noticed, 175b.
 dialect of, 174a. *f.*
 genitives in, 12f., 100ff.
 MSS of in Brit. Mus., 31a.
Odyssey, geography of, 31a.
 signs of Phoenician influence on, 7b. *f.*
 translations from, noticed, 248a. *f.*
 Homeric hymns, dialect of, 199f.
 genitives in, 102a.
 Homeric poems, growth of, 255b.
 Homeridae, 256a.
 δμογάλακτας, 107a.
 ἵππος personified in Plautus, 23a.
 Horace, caesura in Alcaics of, 31b.
Epistles I. ed. Shuckburgh, noticed, 213b.
 glosses in, 31b.
 native land of, 13ff.
 Orelli (ed. 4), noticed, 72ff.
 rare words in *Odes* IV., 73a.
Housman (A. E.), note on Aesch. (*Prom. Vinc.* 488, schol.), 42b.
 note on Isocr. (*Paneg.* 40), *ib.*
 note on σωφρόνη, 242ff.
 Howarth (H.), *Pythagoras in India*, noticed, 321a.
 Huemer (J.), *Sedulii Opera*, noticed, 19 *f.*
vidēs, formation of, 220a.
vidēs, scansion of, 321a.
 Hultsch (F.), *Polybii Historiae*, Vol. I. noticed, 318b. *f.*
 hyperbaton of adjectives, 141a.
 ἐποφῆται (ἐποφῆται, 84a.
 'hypostasised' deities, 288a. *f.*
 Hyvernāt (H.) v. Battifol (P.).
- I, J.
- i*-stems, declension of in early Italian, 274b. *f.*
 Janus, temple of, at Rome, 222a. *f.*
 'ιατρός, cult of, 136a.
 Java, legend of, 322a.
 ἰδέ, Cyprian, 199a.
 elision of, 141b.
Jebb (R. C.), Greek Ode, τῷ ἐν Βοωνίᾳ Πανεπιστημίου, 257ff.
 Greek version of *Adonais*, xlv.-vi., 36f.
 note on *Antig.* (782-90), 261b. *f.*
Phil. (41f.), 324b.
 notice of Warr's *Echoes of Hellas*, 248a. *f.*
 Jebb (R. C.), *Sophocles Antigone*, noticed, 138ff.
Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus, ed. 2, noticed, 74ff.
Jevons (F. B.), notice of Croiset's *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, 255b. *f.*
 of Gruppe's *Griechische Cullen u. Mythen*, u.s.w., 1 *f.*
 Ilberg on the Giants in mythol., 166a.
imperi or *imperi*? 281b. *f.*
imperium, 168a. *f.*
 impf. subj. in conditional sentences, Latin, 282b.
inde, use of, 41b.
 indic. aor. with μή, 324b.
 fut. with μή, 322b. *f.*
indulgeo, sense of in Tacitus, 27a.
 infinitive = imperative? 76b.
- Inge (W. R.), *Society in Rome under the Caesars*, noticed, 289a. *f.*
 Inge v. Rawlins (F. H.).
 inscriptions, Cretan (Axos, Cortyn, &c.), 9ff.
 Cypriote, 156b., 186a., 187a.
 direction of writing in, 196a. *b.*
 Etruscan-Greek, 329b.
 of Laguna, 289a. *f.*
 Lemnian, 232a.
 Naukratis, 233ff.
 Oinian, 326a.
 Pholegandrian, 325b.
 Telmessos, 234b.
 vase-, 188a. *f.*, 233b. *f.*, 234b. *f.*
 restored, 328a.
 instrumental, endings of in early Italian, 191a., 132b., 203b., 204b., 273b., 274a., 275a., 276b., 277a. *b.*
 interpolations in MSS., 30b., 211a.
 -ia stems, decl. of in early Italian, 131b.
 -io stems, 202a. *f.*
 Joel (K.), *Die geistige Entwicklung u.s.w. Platos*, noticed, 206b.
 Johannes of Antioch, G. Sotiriadis on, noticed, 208b. *f.*
 John Malalas, relation to Johannes of Antioch, 209a. *f.*
 John of Damascus, relation to Leontius, 76a. *f.*
 Ionians and writing, 200b.
 Ionic alphabet, 196a.
 capital, 264a. *f.*
 contraction, 199b.
 forms in Hesiod, 197b.
 Jordan's *Sallust*, noticed, 25b.
 'journal' = acre, 261a.
 Jov- stem, relics of in Umbrian, 274b.
ipse, use of, 282a.
ipsum = *se ipsum*, 210a.
 -ir- in Latin, 219a.
 is and *se*, use of, 210a.
 ἰσασί, history of, 66b., 164b.
 'Italia' = province of Milan, 82a.
 Italic alphabets, 146b.
 Italy, travels in, 13ff.
ius, meaning of, 253a.
 Juvenal, notes on, 85b., 326b.
- K.
- Kabeiroi, temple of at Thebes, 91a., 124b.
 Kaehler (O.) v. Teuffel.
 Kaibel (G.), *Athenaeus*, Vol. II., noticed, 80a.
 καὶ μὴν . . . γε, 317a.
 καλαμίτης ἥρωε, 136a.
 καρανιστήρ, 292a.
 κατάληψις, Stoic, 112a.
 κέλυνθος, gender of, analogical, 220a.
 Kennedy (B. H.), *The Revised Latin Primer*, noticed, 279a. *f.*
The Shorter Latin Primer, noticed, *ib.*
 κέρδος, use of in Pindar, 118b.
 Kiepert (H.) v. Ernault.
 κινυραρχός, 187a.
 Kirchhoff (A.), *Studien z. Gesch. d. griech. Alphabets*, ed. 4, noticed, 145ff.
 on Greek alphabets, 194a. *b.*
Kirkpatrick (A. P.), notice of Nestle's *Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices cl.*, 208a.
 Klitias and Ergotimos, fragments by, 238b.
 Klugmann on the Amazons, 134a.
 Köpke (K.), *Cicero's Rede für Cn. Plancius*, ed. Landgraf, noticed, 252a. *f.*
cf. 291a.
 κώμη, renderings of, 28a.

κόπης, meaning of, 139a.

κουροτρόφος, 134b., 167a.

Krumbacher (K.), *Eine Sammlung byzantinischer Sprichwörter*, noticed, 29b.

κρήνα = 'spoils,' 224a., 262a.

Kuhlmann (L.), *Quaestiones Sallustianae criticae*, noticed, 26a.

Kuhn's myth-theory, 2b. f.

Kuhnert on the Giants, 166a.

Kythera, archaeology at, 53b.

L.

labial-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b. f.

Lactantius and Orientius, contrasted, 263b.

Lagina, metrical inscr. from, commented on, 299a. ff.

Landgraf (G.) v. Köpke (E.)

Lang (A.), *Euterpe* &c. *Englished* by 'B. R.', noticed, 250a. f.

theory of myths, 7a.

language, development of, 163b.

Latin Grammar, works on, noticed, 279a. ff.

Lexicography, notes on, 41a. ff.

pronunciation of, 281b. f.

λέβητες, computation by, 11a.

Leeuwen (J. van) and Da Costa, *Homeri Iliadis Carmina cth.*, noticed, 174a. f.

Leicester Codex of the N.T., work on, noticed, 252a.

Lemnos, inscr. from, 146a., 232a.

Leontius of Byzantium, ed. Loofs, noticed, 76a. ff.

Lesbos, custom of, 261b.

Lewy (H.), *Stadtrecht von Gortyn*, noticed, 9a. ff.

lexicography, Latin, 41a. ff.

(Tacitus), 27a.

Greek (Ap. Rhod.), 83a. ff.

-li-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 274b.

Liddell and Scott, references to,

s.v. ἀμύροτος, 84a.

εὐκρηλος, ib.

μαίμω, ib.

ορρός, 98a.

πύχων, 83a. f.

ὑποφύττω, 84a.

Lindsay (W. M.), *The Early Italian Declension*, 129ff., 202ff., 273ff.

Lindsay (W. M.), *Plauti Captivi*, noticed, 177b.

Lipsius (J. H.) v. Meier.

Livy, Bk. xxi. ed. Dimsdale, noticed, 214a.

Bk. v. ed. Luterbacher, noticed, ib.

ed. Weissenborn and Müller, IV. i. (Bks. xxxi.-v.), noticed, 213b. f.

Lloyd (W. Watkiss), note on Pindar (*Nem.* vii.),

-lo-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 202a.

locative, endings of in Latin, &c., 130b., 131a., 132b.,

203b., 204b., 274a., 275a., 276b., 277a., b.

logaedic metres, 221b.

Lolling, *Hellenische Landeskunde*, noticed, 82b.

Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz*, noticed, 76a. ff.

Lucian, *Dialogues*, tr. Williams, noticed, 320a. f.

Iudi Circenses, 214b.

Lupton (J. H.), note on Floyer Sydenham's emendations of Plato, 228a. f.

Lupus (B.), *Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum* (= Cavallari-Holm, *Topographia di Siracusa*), noticed,

215b. f.

Luterbacher (F.), *Livy*, Bk. V., noticed, 214a.

Lycian alphabet, 194b.

Lycurgus, land-division, 33b.

'Lygdamis' inscr., date of, 145b.

Lysias, Blass on, 80b.

Epitaphios, ed. Snell, noticed, 113a. f.

Orationes Selectae, ed. Weidner, noticed, 114a. f.

Lytto, inscr. at, 11b.

M.

-m lost in Latin, 202a.

in Umbrian, 202b.

Macan (R. W.), notice of Sitzler's *Herodotus*, Bk. VIII., 79a.

Macnaghten (H.), notes on Euripides (*Bacchae*), 224a. ff.

(*Ion*, 1601-8), 42a.

Madvig (J. N.), *Opuscula Academica*, ed. 2, noticed 30a.

Maenad ceremonies, 165a.

Magister Caesar, Latin grammar of, 214b. f.

Maier (O.), *Die Weltkarte des Castorius* (Tab. Peutingeriana), noticed, 179a.

μαίμω in Ap. Rhod., 84a.

Malalas, Johannes and John of Antioch, 209a.

date of, 209b.

Manetho, genitives in, 13a.

Manuscripts in Brit. Mus., 102ff., 171ff.

of Aeschylus, 172a.

Aristophanes, 173b. f.

Euripides, 172b. f.

Hesiod, 171a.

Homer, 102a. ff.

Pindar, 172a.

Poetae Lyrici, 171b.

Solon, ib.

Sophocles, 172a.

Theognis, 171b.

Greek, in the *Bibl. Nationale*, 217b. f.

the New Testament, 312a. ff.

Nonius, 315b. ff.

Marquardt v. Vigie.

Marrucine declension, 130ff., 202ff., 273ff.

Marsic declension, ibb.

Matheson (P. E.) v. Abbott (E.)

Mayer (M.), *Die Giganten u. Titanen u.s.w.*, noticed, 288a. f.

Mayor (J. B.), note on Persius (III. 29), 85b.

notice of Merguet's *Lexikon z. d. philos. Schr. Ciceros*, I. II., 211b. f.

Mayor (J. E. B.), notes on Latin Lexicography, 41a. ff.

notice of Madvig, *Opuscula Academica*, ed. 2, 30a.

μή with aorist indic., 324b.

with future indic., 322b. ff.

μή οὐ with participle, 75b., 79a.

μή τί γε, 207b.

Meier (M. H. E.) u. Schömann, *Der Attische Process*, ed. Lipsius, noticed, 245a. ff.

Merguet, *Lexikon z. d. philos. Schr. Ciceros*, I. II., noticed, 211b. f.

Merk (C.), notice of Battifol-Hyvernat's *Didascalica*, 81a.

of Hilgenfeld's *Hermes Pastor*, 252a. f.

of Wohlenberg's *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel u.s.w. (Didache)*, 286a. f.

Merry (W. W.), note on Juvenal (XI. 106), 85b.

notice of Edwards, *Odyssey ix.*, 175b.

of Teuffel (Kaehler), *Die Wolken des Aristophanes*, 205a.

merum, use of, illustrated, 85a. cf. 226a.

Metapontum, abecedarium of, 146b.

μεταξὺ, use of, 324b.

metro, Greek, 221a. f.

Meyer (E.), on Ammon, noticed, 134a.

on Astarte, noticed, 136a.

Michaelis on Δημοσθένους ἐπιβώμιος, 149b.

Miller (K.), introduction to Maier's *Tabula Peutingeriana*, noticed, 179a.

money, coined in, Crete, 11a.

monosyllables, genitives of, 101a.

- Montluc (Blaise de), *Commentaries*, and the siege of Plataea, 119a. f.
 morgen, Germ. = 'acre,' 261a.
 Morris (W.), *The Odyssey of Homer. Done into English Verse*, Vol. II., noticed, 35b.
Morsehead (E. D. A.), notice of Young, *Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus*, translated, 35a. ff.
 Moschus, genitives in, 13b.
Moulton (J. H.), notice of Conway's *Verner's Law in Italy*, 218b.
 Moulton (J. H.), on hard aspirates in Greek, 162a.
 Müller (J.), *Handbuch d. klass. Altertumswiss.*, VII., noticed, 201ff.
 Müller (L.), *Notii Marcelli Compend. Doctrina*, Pt. I., noticed, 314a. ff.
 Müller (Max), on myths, 2b., 4b.
Mullinger (J. Bass), notice of De Nolhac's *Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, 116b.
Murray (A. S.), notes on archaeology (vase-painting —illustration of *Phoenissae*—temple of Delphi), 327a. ff.
 Murray (A. S.), on the vase from Hawara, 297a.
 Musaeus, genitives in, 13a. f.
 Myrina, terra-cottas from, 50ff., 120a. f., 154a. f.
 mythology, Greek, works on, noticed, 1ff., 287ff.
 Roman, works on, 307ff.
 Roscher's *Lexicon* of, noticed, 133ff., 16ff., 307ff.
 Myths, Greek Cults and, Gruppe on, noticed, 1ff.

N.

- Nauck v. Schneidewin.
 Naucratis, antiquities from, 232a. f.
 date of Ionic inscr. at, 146a.
 Naxos, alphabet of, ib.
Neil (R. A.), notice of Blaydes' *Aristophanes, Plutus and Acharnians*, 317a. ff.
 Nestle's *Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices etc.*, noticed, 208a.
Nettleship (H.), address to Prof. Georges, 334f.
 note on *sportula*, 37a.
 (reply to, 149b.)
 notice of Fierville, *Une Gram. Lat. Inéd. du xiii. siècle*, 224b. f.
 notice of Recent Latin Grammars, 279ff.
 notice of Thilo-Hagen's *Servius*, 82a.
 neuter plural in *a*, 204a., 274a., 276b.
 New Guinea, custom of, 222a.
 Newman (W. L.), *Aristotle's Politics*, Vols. I. II., noticed, 104ff.
 New Testament criticism, 312a. ff.
 Leicester codex of, 252a.
 new words mentioned,
 ἀρχαῖαι λέξεις, 156b., 186a.
 confusicius, 23b.
 convidium, 23a.
 dismaritus, ib.
 exconcinnare, 23b.
 exscissatus, ib.
 *ἡμα (= 'seat'), 324a.
 iacturor, 28a.
 *ἡμεῖς, 225b.
 periacti, 25b.
 rāvim, 23b.
 semitelus, 25b.
 Nicolaus Damascenus, [Aristotle] *De Mundo*, 305a.
 Nicosthenes, fragments of, 233b., 234a.
 Nilus, representations of, 330b.
Nixon (J. E.), note on Catullus (lxiv. 22-4), 226a.
 note on Iliad (II. 354-6), 323b.
 Noldeke (Th.), *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, noticed, 80b. f.

- Nolhac (P. de), *La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, noticed, 116b.
 nominative, endings of, in early Italian, 129b., 131a., 132a. b., 202a., 203b. f., 273a., 274a. b., 275a. b., 276a. b., 277a. b.
 non...verum and non modo...verum, 210b.
 Nonius, ed. Mueller, noticed, 314a. ff.
 Nonius and Servius, 82b.
 nubere, construction of in Cicero, 210b.
 numerals, corrupted, 319b. f.

O.

- ω in Greek presents, 65a.
 -ō from -ōm in Latin presents, 65a. b.
 impossibility of, 163a.
 -ō forms in nom. sg., 65b., 117a., 163a.
 o stems, decl. of in early Italian, 202ff.
 Odyssey, genitives in, 12a. b.
 geography of, 31a.
 oīda, constructions of, 76b.
 oīda, as social unit, 107a.
 Oinia, inscr. from, 326a.
Oman (C.), notice of Head's *Brit. Mus. Catal. of Gk. coins: Attica &c.*, 231a. f.
 Omont (H.), *MSS. Grecs de la Bibl. Nationale: Parts 1 and 2*, noticed, 217b. f.
Old-Latin Biblical Texts, Parts I. II., noticed, 27b.
 Part III., noticed, 312ff.
Onions (J. H.), notice of Mueller's *Nonius*, 314a. ff.
 of Sioiman's *Phormio*, 23b.
 optative, use of, 76a., 110b.
 optimus, pronunciation of, 282a.
 Orelli, *Horace* (ed. 4), noticed, 72ff.
 'Orestes, Story of,' 248a. f.
 Oriental influence on Greece, 4a., 8b.
Orientalis Carmina, ed. Ellis, noticed, 19ff.
 Orientius and Lactantius contrasted, 263b.
 Oropus, archaeology at, 124a.
 Orphic poems, genitives in, 13a. b.
 ὀρφος, note on, 97a. ff.
 Oscan declension, 129ff., 202ff., 273ff.
 Osthoff, on the personal endings, 163b.
 -οσύνη, words ending with, in trag., 245b.
 οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ, sense of, 207b.
 Ovid, *Tristia*, notes on, 180b. f.
 use of legends by, 181a.
Owen (S. G.), notes on Ovid, *Tristia*, 180b. f.

P.

- Page (T. E.)**, note on Roman phraseology in S. Luke, 227a. f.
 (commented on, 262a. f.)
 notice of Orelli's *Horace*, 72ff.
 (commented on, 117. cf. 148a.)
 Paley (F. A.), *Ajax of Sophocles*, noticed, 205b.
Suppliant Women of Euripides, noticed, 318a. f.
Pallis (A.), note on Sophocles (*Oed. Col.* 1466), 42a.
Palmer (A.), note on Catullus, 84b.
 on Euripides (*I. A.* 722-4), 262a.
 on a passage in the Gospels, 227b.
 on Plautus (*Amphitr.* 1072), 326a.
 Propertiana, 38b. ff.
 on Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, 181a. f.
 Pamphylia, alphabet of, 194b., 195.
 Paphos, excavations at, 155f., 186f.
 parallelism in sound, 114a.
 Parthenon, sculptures on the, 134b., 135a.
Paton (W. R.), note on ἀργυροθεΐσαι πρόσωπα, 180a. (commented on, 261a.)
 on the Ceramic gulf, 323b. f.

- Paton (W. R.), *continued*—
 on Chryse, 123a.
 on Theocritus, vii., 265a. f.
 Paul, St., *First Epist. Corinth.*, ed. Ellicott, noticed, 115b. ff.
 πήχυον in Apoll. Rhod., 83a. f.
 Pelle (J.), on Walker's Philological Notes, 163f.
 Pelham (H. F.), notice of Herzog's *Gesch. d. röm. Staatsverfassung*, II. i., 168ff.
 Pelham, on renderings of κῶμη, 28a.
 Pelignian declension, 129ff., 202ff., 273ff.
 Penteskuphia, pottery-fragments from, 146a.
 περὶ ασι, history of, 161b.
 περικᾶσι, 66b., 164b.
 perfect-endings, 66a. f., 117a. f., 162a. f., 164a. f.
 subjunctive in Latin, 282b.
 περί ἀφθορίας, Arnim on the sources of, 320b.
 περιβαλεῖν, construction of, 225a.
 personal-endings, 66a. f., 117a. f., 162a. f. 164a.
 personification in Plautus, 23a.
 Perugia, archaeol. at, 124a.
 Peskett (A. G.), note on [Caesar], *B.G.* viii. (praef. § 2), 326a. f.
 on Pliny, *H.N.* (ii. § 1), 226b.
 Peter's articles in Roscher's *Mythol. Lex.*, noticed (Avernus, Damia, Epona, Fortuna), 310a. ff.
 Peutingeriana tabula, 179a.
 φέρω = φέρω, 65a., 117a.
 Philargyrius, 82a.
 *philice, 23a.
 Philo (Byblius), 8b.
 (Judaicus), Arnim on, noticed, 320b. f.
 Philoctetes, legend of, 123a. f.
 Phocians in Sicily, 180a.
 Phoenician alphabet in Greece, 12a., 145a.
 influence in Greece, 7b. f., 34b.
 Phoenixiae, vase-illustrations of, 326b. ff.
 Pholegandros, inscription from, 325b.
 φωσφόρος, of Hekate, 167a.
 φρασί, 220a.
 Piers Plowman and the *Didache*, 263a.
 Pindar, genitives in, 99b.
 hiatus in, *ib.*
 MSS. of, 172a.
 note on (*Nem.* vii.), 118a.
 pinus, gender of, 220a.
 Pitture d'Ercolano, I. pl. 7, 327b.
 Plancius Cn., date of trial of, 253a.
 Plataea, siege of, paralleled, 119a.
 Plato, *Apology*, ed. Stock, noticed, 28b.
Cratylus, Cucuel on, noticed, 205b. f.
Crito, editions of, noticed, 175b.
Meno, ed. Stock, noticed, 28b.
 mental development of, Joel on, noticed, 206b.
 Platt (J. A.), Notes on the Homeric Genitive, 12ff., 99ff., 149a.
 notice of van Leeuwen and Da Costa's *Iliad*, 174a. f.
 Plautus, *Capituli*, ed. Lindsay, noticed, 177b. f.
Casina and *Cistellaria*, ed. Ussing, noticed, 21f.
 metres of, 177b. f.
 personification in, 23a.
 pleonasm in, 23b.
 Pliny, *Selected Letters*, ed. Prichard-Bernard, noticed, 214a. f.
 the elder, illustrations of, 327a. f.
 ploughing, in primitive communities, 261a., 291a. f.
 Plummer (A.), notice of Ellicott's *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 115b.
 Plutarch, lexicography of, 208b.
Nikias, ed. Holden, noticed, 208a. f.
 and Solon's legislation, 241a., 290b.
 ποιεῖν, meanings of, 114a., 116b.
 πόλεε &c., not classical, 218b.
 Politian on Vergil, 82a.
 πολός in Homer, 321a.
 Polybius, ed. Hultsch, Vol. I., noticed, 318b. ff.
 hiatus in, 319a.
History of Achaean League, ed. Capes, noticed, 250b. ff.
 and Strabo, 84a.
 Polyclitus, copy of work by, 232a.
 Pompeii, archaeol. at, 54a.
 Porta Trigemina, supposed discovery of, 124b.
 Postgate (J. P.) and Vince (C. H.), *The New Latin Primer*, noticed, 279a. ff.
 postilena, 22b.
 potione, 28a.
 Pottier (E.) and Reinach (S.), *La Nécropole de Myrina*, noticed, 50ff.
 Praxiteles, new work of, 54a. f.
 Preller (L.), *Griechische Mythologie*, ed. 4, I. i. (Robert), noticed, 287a. ff.
 present reduplication, 220a.
 Prichard (C. E.) v. Bernard (E. R.)
princeps, meanings of, 168a. f.
 Priscian and Latin grammar, 215a.
Prisciani Lydi quae exstant ctt., ed. Bywater, noticed, 17f.
 Proclus, genitives in, 13a.
 πρόκριτος = *princeps*, 168b.
 Πρόνοια 'Αθήνης, worshipped, 137a.
 pronouns, Homeric forms, 175a.
 pronunciation of Latin, 281b. f.
 propagation of myths, 5a., 6b.
 προηλακίζω, derivn. of, 251b. f.
 proper names, construction with, 210b.
 Propertiana, 38b. ff.
 προφορά = 'pronunciation,' 142b.
 Proverbs:—
 Ἀπὸ κλέπτου κλέψον, 30a.
 Γέροντα Σαρακηνόν, *ib.*
 Ἐάν σοι ἐλθῇ, *ib.*
 Ἐκατὸν Παῦλοι ἀπέθανον, *ib.*
 Κάμνει ὁ πῖθος, *ib.*
 Ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὰ ῥούχα, *ib.*
 Ὅπου φιλεῖς μὴ δαείξῃς, *ib.*
 Ὅρθαν τὰν ναῦν, 119a.
 Πρὶν πυγῆς δὲς τὸν ναῦλον, 30a.
 Σιγηροῦ ποταμοῦ, *ib.*
Sutrium ire, 22b.
 provincia, derivation of, 227b. f.
 φοροδής, 208b.
 Ptolemaeus, towns mentioned by, 189a.
 Fuchstein (O.), *Das Ionische Capitell*, noticed, 264a. ff.
 Purser (L. C.), note on Plato (*Gorg.* 494b.), 225b. f.
 on Quintilian (x. 3, 23), 226b.
 Πύξα (?) (Φύξα) in Theocr. vii., 265b.
 Pyrrho, philosophy of, 112a.
 Pythagoras in India, 321a.

Q.

- qui et, with second names, 227b., 262a. f.
 Quintus Smyrnaeus, genitives in, 13a. f.
 quocum in Cicero, 210b.
 quoppiam, *ib.*

R.

- r-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b. f.
 Ramsay (W. M.), note on Ephesian terra-cottas, 235a.
 on inscr. from Oinía, 326a.
 on Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, 262a. f.
 notice of Pottier-Reinach, *La Nécropole de Myrina*, 50a. f.

- Ramsay (W. M.), *continued*—
 of Preller, *Griechische Mythologie* (ed. Robert), 287a. ff.
 of Roberts' *Greek Epigraphy*, I., 93ff.; cf. 263b. f.
- Rankin (D.)**, notes on the *Choephoroi*, 222b. f.
- Rapp's articles in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed (Bellerophon, Boreas), 137b.
- rare words in Horace, *Odes* IV., 73a.
- Rawlins (F. H.) and Inge (W. R.), *The Eton Latin Grammar*, noticed, 279a. ff.
- recitations, Homeric, 256a. ff.
- redonabo \ condonabo, 73b.
- reduplication, present, 220a.
- referre \ relationem facere, 169a.
- Reid (J. S.)**, notice of Schiche (Th.), *Cicero, Tusculans*, 210b. f.
 of Thomas (E.), *Discours de Cicéron contre Verres* IV., 210a. f.
 of Vollgraff (J. C.), *Cicero, Pro Caelio*, 211a.
- Reinach (S.)**, on the Asiatic terra-cottas, 119ff., 153ff.
- Reinach (S.) v. Pottier (E.)
- Ῥι(σ)όμοι, Sophoclean fragment, 167a.
- Rhodes, alphabet of, 146a., 196a.
- rhotacism and accent, 219a.
- Umbrian, 202b.
- ri-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 274b.
- Richard of Cirencester, authenticity of, 147b.
- Richards (H.)**, notes on Juvenal (x. 54, xiv. 24), 326b.
 on Plato (*Rep.* 498A.), 324b.
 notice of Susemihl, *Aristotelis Oeconomica*, 115b.
- Ridgeway (W.)**, note on Euripides (*Ion.* 576-80), 225a. f.
 on Strabo, 84a. f.
 on Thucydides (VI. 2), 180a. f.
- Ritchie (D. G.)**, notice of Newman, *Aristotle, Politics*, I. II., 104ff.
- ro-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 202a.
- Robert (C.) v. Preller (L.)
- Roberts (A.), *Greek the Language of Christ*, &c., noticed, 142ff.
- Roberts (E. S.)**, notice of Kirchhoff's *Studien z. Gesch. d. griech. Alphabets*, ed. 4, 145a. ff.
 of works in archaic Cretan inscr., 9a. ff.
- Roberts (E. S.), *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, Part I., noticed, 193ff.
- Roberts (W. Rhys)**, notice of Krumbacher's *Sammlung byzantinischer Sprichwörter*, 29b. f.
 of Williams' transl. of Lucian, *Dialogues*, 320a. f.
- Robertson (A.)**, notice of Harris (J. Rendel), *Origin of Leicester Codex of N. T.*, 252a.
- Rohde (D.), *Adiectivum quo ordine apud Sallustium ctt.*, noticed, 26a. f.
- Roman antiquities, 201f.
 architecture, 297a.
 art, 296a. ff.
 law, 201b.
 mythology, articles on, noticed, 307a. ff.
- Rome, archaeology at, 124b.
 causes of decline of, 217a. f.
 society in, under the Caesars, 289b.
- roots, origin of, 220a. f.
- Roscher (W. H.), *Ausführliches Lexicon d. griech. u. röm. Mythologie*, noticed (Greek articles), 133ff., 164ff.
 (Roman articles), 307ff.
- Rosbach (A.) and Westphal (R.), *Theorie d. musischen Künste d. Hellenen*, Vol. III., noticed, 221a. f.
- runt, -rant, Latin endings, 132a., 164b.
- Rutherford (W. G.)**, notes on Aeschylus, 261b., 291b. ff.
 on Thucydides (II. 76), 261b.; cf. 292b.
 notice of Greek Grammars, 218a. f.
- s and f confused in MSS., 28a.
- s lost in Faliscan, 202b., 273a.
 in Latin, 202a.
 pronunciation of, in Latin, 282a.
- s-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 275b. f.
- Sabine o-stems, 202b.
- Salisbury, archaeology at, 91a.
- Sallust, Eussner's text, noticed, 25b. f.
 Jacobs-Wirz., ed. 9, noticed, 26a.
 Jordan, ed. 3, noticed, 25b.
 Catiline, ed. Turner, noticed, 26b.
- Historica, Die Orléaner Palimpsestfragmente zu* (Hauler), noticed, 25a. f.
- Jugurtha, ed. Schmalz, noticed, 26a.
 v. Kuhlmann (L.), Rohde (D.)
- 'Salmasian' excerpts, 209a.
- Salvianus, *admodum* in, 41b.
- 'salutatio,' a mode of conferring imperium, 168b.
- Sampi, sign for, 145b.
- sav, 3 pl. ending, 161b.
- Sanday (W.)**, notice of *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.* III. (Claudianus Mamertus, Sedulius, Orientius), 19ff.
- Sandys (J. E.)**, note on Δημοσθένης ἐπιβόμος, 149a.
 notice of Blass (F.), *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, ed. 2, 80a. f.
 of editions of Lysias, 113a. ff.
 of Maier's *Tabula Peutingeriana*, 179a.
 of Schaefer's *Demosthenes u. seine Zeit*, 31b. ff.
- sarr, 3 pl. pf. endg., 161a.
- satyrs, Welcker's theory concerning, 165b.
- Sauer (B.), *Die Anfänge der statuarischen Gruppe*, noticed, 231b. f.
- Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, 227a. f., 262a. f.
- Sayce, on personal suffixes, 163a.
- Schaarschmidt, on Plato's *Cratylus*, 206a.
- Schaefer (A.), *Demosthenes u. seine Zeit* (revised ed.), noticed, 31b. ff.
- Scheindler (A.), *Methodik des gram. Unterrichts im Griech.*, noticed, 218b.
- Scherer's article on Hades, in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed, 166b.
- Schiche (Th.), *M. T. Ciceronis Tusculanarum Libri Quinque*, noticed, 210b. f.
- Schiller (H.), *Die Römischen Alterthümer* (in Müller's *Handbuch*), noticed, 201f.
- Schmalz, *Sallust, Jugurtha*, noticed, 26a.
- Schmidt (B.), *Catullus*, noticed, 70f.
- Schneidewin (F. W.), *Sophocles, Aias, Philoctetes*, ed. 9 (Nauck), noticed, 249a. f.
- Schömann (G. F.) v. Meier.
- Schreiber's article on Artemis, in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed, 135b.
- scripsen = scripsi, 66a., 164a.
- sculptures of temple at Delphi, 328a. f.
- se and is, use of, 210a.
- Seaton (R. C.)**, note on Apoll. Rhod., lexicography of, 83a. f.
 note on Pindar and Euripides, 324a.
 notice of Bell's *Caesar*, *Bell. Gall.* I., 209b. f.
- sed, use of, 23a.
- Sedulii *Opera Omnia*, ed. Huemer, noticed, 19a. ff.
- Seisachtheia of Solon, 241a. ff.
- Sellar (W. Y.)**, notice of Bowen's *Virgil in English Verse*, 66ff.
- Σελλοί, 322b.
- seminez in nominative, 326a.
- Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, note on, 181a. f.
- Septuagint, MSS. of, 208a.
 used by Jews, 143f.
- Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Verg. Comment.*, ed. Thilo-Hagen III. I., noticed, 82a. f.

- Servius and Nonius, 82a.
and Verrius Flaccus, 82b.
Shelley's *Adonais* xlv.-xvi. done into Greek senarii, 36f.
Shuckburgh (E. S.), notice of Weissenborn's *Xenophon, Memorabilia*, 29a.
Shuckburgh (E. S.), *Horace, Epistles*, Bk. I., noticed, 213b.
Shute (R.), *On the History of the Aristotelian Writings*, noticed, 305ff.
sibilants in Latin and Umbrian, 219a.
symbols for in Pamphylian, 195a. f.
Sibyls, 287b.
Sicily, races in, 280a. f.
Sicyon, alphabet of, 146a.
vases from, 196a.
Sidgwick (A.), notice of Gow's *Companion to School Classics*, 255b. f.
of Stone's *Herodotus, The Ionic Revolt*, 79a.
Sidgwick (A.), *Aeschylus, Eumenides*, noticed, 108ff.
P. Vergilii Maronis Bucolica, noticed, 212a. f.
Sigeon monument, date of, 145b.
Sikyon, archaeology at, 54b.
Sirina (mod. Hagios Joannis), 329a.
Sitzler, *Herodotus*, Bk. VIII., noticed, 79a.
Sloman (J. H.), *Terenti Phormio*, noticed, 23b. f.
Smith (Cecil), archaeological notes, 52b. ff., 90a. ff., 123b. ff., 185a. ff.
note on discoveries at Telmessos, 234b.
on Haleis and Pyza, 265b.
on recent acquisitions of British Museum, 232a. ff., 266a. f., 297a. f., 329b. f.
notice of Brunn's *Denkmäler*, 188a.
of Burn's *Roman Literature in relation to Roman Art*, 296a. f.
Smith (W. Robertson), notice of Noldeke's *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, 80b. f.
Snow (T. C.), comments on Mr. Walker's *Philological Notes*, 117a. f.
Smyrna, terra-cottas from, 120a. b.
socius, application of, 210b.
Socrates, a believer in immortality, 176a.
Solon, legislation of, 241a. ff., 290a. f.
MS. of, 171b.
Sonnenschein v. Nettleship.
Sophocles, *Aias*, *Philoctetes* (ed. Schneidewin-Nauck), noticed, 249a. f.
Ajax (ed. Paley), noticed, 205b.
Antigone (ed. Holub), noticed, 249b. f.
(ed. Jebb), noticed, 138ff.
new line of, 324b.
Oedipus Tyrannus (ed. 2, Jebb), noticed, 74ff.
translated by Young, noticed, 35a. f.
Περσέων, fragment, 167a.
σάφρονη = *σαφροσίνη*, 242a. ff.
Sotiriadis (G.), *Zur Kritik des Johannes von Antiochia*, noticed, 208b. ff.
sportula, note on, 37a., 149b.
Springhead, archaeology at, 90a.
'Stalino' in Plautus, *Casina*, 21b.
Stanwell (H. B.), note on Persius (iii. 29), 85a. f.
Stephenson (H. M.), note on *sportula*, 149b.
notice of Dimsdale's *Livy*, xxi., 214a.
Standing's articles in Roscher, *Myth, Lex.*, noticed (Ferentina, Feronia, Flora), 311b. f.
(Hekate), 167a.
Stock (St. George), *Plato, Apology and Meno*, noticed, 28b.
'Story of Orestes', 248a. f.
Stone (E. D.), notice of Campbell's *Leptodendron Septentrionale*, 321a. f.
Strabo, biographical details about, 84a. f.
Γεωγραφικά, where written, 84b.
two historical works by, 84a.
- Strachan-Davidson (J. L.)**, notice of Hultsch's *Polybius*, Vol. I., 318b. ff.
strophic arrangement of early Epic poetry, 198a. b., 200a. b.
responsion in Greek dramas, 31b.
subjunctive, Latin:
imperfect in conditional sentences, 282b.
perfect, *ib.*
Suidas and Strabo, 84a.
sum = *for*, 65b.; cf. 163b.
Summaries of Periodicals:—
Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres:
Comptes-Rendus, 56b.
Academy, 58a., 92a., 126a., 157a., 235a., 268a., 299b., 331a.
American Journal of Archaeology, 267b., 298b. f.
American Journal of Philology, 58a., 157a., 330a. f.
Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique, 57a., 157b., 235b., 267b., 299b.
Antike Denkmäler, 91b.
Antiquaries, Proceedings of London Society of, 92a.
Archaeol. Institute of America: Papers of Amer. School of Classical Studies at Athens, 267a.
Archaeological Journal, 92b.
Review, 299a. f.
Archäologisches Jahrbuch, 91b., 190b., 298b.
Arch.-Epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich, 57a., 190b.
Archiv. für lateinische Lexicographie, 93b., 159a.
Asiatic Quarterly Review, 92a.
Athenaeum, 58a., 92a. b., 157a., 191a., 268a., 331a.
Athenische Mittheilungen, 190a., 267a., 298a.
Berliner Philolog. Wochenschrift, 94a. f., 302b. f.
Biblical Archaeology, Proceedings of Society of, 92a., 190b.
Builder, 56b., 92b., 125b.
Bull. Correspondance Hellénique, 91b., 189b., 298a. f.
Bull. dell. Commissione Arch. Comunale di Roma, 56b., 189b., 267a., 299a.
Δελτίον Ἀρχαιολογικόν, 188a.
Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 298b.
Expositor, 128a., 235a. f.
Gazette Archéologique, 56b., 91b., 189b., 267a., 298a.
Gazette des Beaux Arts, 56b., 92a.
Hermathena, 299a. f.
Hermes, 158a. f., 237b. ff., 331a. ff.
Jahresber. üb. d. Fortschritte d. class. Alterthumswissenschaft, 191b., 236a. f.
Journal of Hellenic Studies, 125b., 267b.
Kuhn's Zeitschrift, 269b.
Leipziger Studien, 191a.
Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, 127b., 269b.
Neue Jahrbücher, 126a., 239a. f., 300b. f.
Numismatic Chronicle, 92b., 157b., 235b., 268a. f.
Numismatische Zeitschrift, 235b.
Philologischer Anzeiger, 58b. f., 334a. f.
Philologische Rundschau, 59b. f., 237a. f., 268b. f.
Philologus, 93a., 300a. f.
Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale, 57b.
Revue Archéologique, 56a., 190a., 266b.
Revue belge de Numismatique, 125a.
Revue de Linguistique, 128a.
Revue Numismatique, 57a., 125a., 235b., 299b.
Revue de Philologie, 95a., 236b. f., 333b. f.
Rheinisches Museum, 92b., 268a. f., 303b.

Summaries of Periodicals, *continued*—

- Römische Mittheilungen, 190b.
Theologische Literaturzeitung, 61b.
Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie, 301a. f.
Zeitschrift f. d. Gymnasial-wesen, 94a., 127b., 333a. f.
Zeitschrift für Numismatik, 125a., 267b.
συμφέρειν βουλευματα, 75a., 149a.
συμφορά, use of, 148b.
σύνδικον, *συνδίκας* in Pindar, 324a.
Susemihl (F.), *Aristotelis Oeconomica*, noticed, 115b.
Sutrium ire, proverbial, 22b.
sunus, use of, 282a.
Sybel, von, on Ate, in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed, 136a.
Sydenham (Fl.), emendations of Plato, 228a. f.
syncope of *o* in Latin, 202a.
Syracuse, antiquities of, 215b. f.

T.

- Tabula Peutingeriana*, ed. Maier, noticed, 179a.
Tacitus, *Annals*, ed. 5, Draeger, noticed, 26b.
and Virgil, 226a.
Tale of Troy, 248a. f.
ταυλας, public, at Athens, 255a.
Tartar legends, 322a.
Tatham (M. T.), note on Livy (xxiii. 5, 12), 226a. f.
Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 287a.
Taylor (C.), notes on the *Διδασχῆ*, 262b. f.
notice of the Johns Hopkins ed. of the *Διδασχῆ*, 283a. ff.
Teaching of the Apostles v. Didache.
Telmessos, antiquities at, 234b.
inscription from, *ib.*
tenus: *tenor*, 220a.
Terence, *Phormio*, ed. Sloman, noticed, 23b.
terna-cottas, 'Asiatic,' 120a. ff., 153a. ff.
in Cyprus, 187a. f.
tesserae found at Perugia, 124a.
Teuffel (W. S.), *Die Wolken des Aristophanes*, ed. 2 (Kaehler), noticed, 205a.
Teuffel's *Roman Literature*, notes on 263b.
textual criticism, Aristophanes, 317a. ff.
Cicero, 211a.
Diog. Laertius, 278b. f.
New Testament, 312a. ff.
Nonius, 315a. ff.
Polybius, 318b. ff.
Sophocles, 249a. ff.
θ a spirant, 10b.
Thasos, alphabet of, 195b
archaeology at, 124b.
-the, ending of 2 pl. perf., 162a.
Thebes, archaeology at, 54b., 91a., 124b.
thematic flexion not excluding non-thematic forms, 163b.
Themistocles and Ulysses in Pindar, 118b.
Theocritus VII., local illustration of, 265a. f.
genitives in, 13b.
Theognis, MSS. of, catalogued, 173b.
Theogony, Hesiodic, 197a.
Orphic, 197b.
Theophrastus, physics of, 18a.
Theophylactus Simocatta, *Historiae*, ed. de Boor, noticed, 290a. f.
Thera, Coan inscr. at, 146a.
Thespieae, stelae found at, 146b.
Thilo-Hagen, ed. of Servius, III. i., noticed, 82a.
Thomas (E.), *Discours de Cicéron contre Verres IV.*, noticed, 210a. f.
Thompson (E. M.), Catalogue of Classical Manuscripts in British Museum, 102f., 171f.

Thompson (E. M.), *continued*—

- notice of Omont's *Inventaire Sommaire des MSS. Grecs*, &c., 217a. f.
Thompson (V. T.), note on the siege of Plataea, 119a. f.
Thraemer's articles in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.*, noticed (Asclepius), 136a.
(Dionysos), 164a. f.
Thucydides, index to, noticed, 115a.
-ti stems, decl. of in early Italian, 274b.
Tien, Neo-Hellenic Manual, noticed, 179b.
Tilley (A.), note on the ages of the Gracchi, 37b. f.
Timocrates epitaph restored, 118a.
Titan, use of as epithet, 288b.
τιθημι with infin., construction of, 243b.
τοῖς, Delphian adverb, 198a.
τὸ λοιπόν, meaning of, 227b., 325a.
Torr (C.), note on chronology of Solon, 290a. ff.
on vases at Athens, 188a. f.
notice of Apostolides' *Interprétation de l'Inscription pré-Hellénique de l'Île de Lemnos*, 232a.
of Bie's *Musen in der antiken Kunst*, 188a.
Tozer (H. F.), on the native land of Horace, 13ff.
notice of Lolling's *Hellenische Landeskunde u. a. w.*, 82b.
of Tien's *Neo-Hellenic Manual*, 179b.
tragedy, Greek, metrical studies in, 31b.
translations noticed—
Aeschylus, 248a. f.
Herodotus, 250a. f.
Homer, 35a., 248a. f.
Lucian, 320a. f.
Sophocles, 35a. f.
Virgil, 66f.
τρίσροδες, as a standard of value, 11a.
trifae aures in Cicero, 85a.
Trojans in Sicily, 180a. f.
Tryphiodorus, genitives in, 13a.
Turner (B. D.), *Sullust, Catiline*, noticed, 26b.
Tyrrell (R. Y.), notice of Holub's *Sophoclis Antigone*, 249b. f.
of Jebb's *Sophocles, Antigone*, 138ff.
of Usings' *Plautus, Casina and Cistellaria*, 21f.

U, V.

- u*-stems, decl. of in early Italian, 273a. ff.
vases, 188a. ff., 234b. f., 266a., 327a. f., 328a., 329b. f.
vates, sense of, 69b.
ve...vel, 85b.
Venus v. Aphrodite.
Verner's law, applied to Latin, 218b. f.
Verrall (A. W.), note on *συμφορά*, 148a. f.; cf. 75a.
notice of Gitlbauer's *Philologische Streifzüge*, 30b. ff.
Verrall, on tragic use of words in *-ορνῆ*, 245b.
Verrius Flaccus and Servius, 82a.
versura, 217b.
Vestine declension, 129b. ff., 202b. f.
vettha, Sanskrit, history of, 162b.
Uhlig, *Grammatici Graeci*, 181b.
vida, Sanskrit, history of, 162b.
Vigie (A.), *De l'Organisation financière chez les Romains* (translated from Marquardt), noticed, 216b. f.
Vigle, inscr. at, 10b. f.
Vince (C. H.) v. Postgate (J. P.)
Vincentius Heremita on Latin prosody, 214b., 215a.
Virgil, *Eclogues* and *Aeneid I.-VI.* In *English Verse* (Bowen), noticed, 66ff.
Eclogues, ed. Sidgwick, noticed, 212a. ff.

Umbrian declension, 129b. *f.*, 202b. *f.*, 273a. *f.*
 rhotacism in, 219a.
unde, use of, 41b.
 Vollgraff (J. C.), *M. T. Ciceronis pro M. Caelio*
Oratio, noticed, 211a. *f.*
 volutes of capitals, 265a.
 vocative endings in Latin, 130b., 131b., 132b., 203b.,
 205a. b., 273b., 274a., 275a. b., 276b., 277a. b.
 Voigt (M.), *Die Römischen Alterthümer* (in Müller's
Handbuch), noticed, 201*f.*
 Usener (H.), *Epicurea*, noticed, 278*f.*
 Ussing, *Plautus, Casina* and *Cistellaria*, noticed,
 21a. *f.*
 usury at Rome, 217b.

W.

Waldstein (C.), on *Δημοσθένης ἐπιθόμιος*, 149b.
 Walker (F. W.), *Philological Notes*, 65*f.*, 161*f.*
 Warr (G. C.), notice of Fick's works on the dialect
 of Hesiod and the Homeric hymns, 196*f.*
 Warr (G. C.), *Echoes of Hellas*, noticed, 248a. *f.*
 Weiss's view of the gospels, 144a.
 Weissenborn, *Livy*, Bks. xxxi.-v. (ed. Müller),
 noticed, 213b. *f.*
Xenophon's Memorabilia, noticed, 29a.
 Welcker's theory of the satyrs, 165b.
 Westphal (R.) and Gleditsch (H.), *Allgemeine Theorie*
der griech. Metrik, noticed, 221a. *f.*
 Wheeler (B. J.), *Analogy and the scope of its applica-*
tion, noticed, 219b. *f.*
 Wheeler (J. R.), on archaeological schools at Athens,
 43a. *f.*
 White (H. J.), *The Four Gospels from the Munich M.S.*,
 noticed, 312a. *f.*
 v. Wordsworth.
 Whitelaw (R.), note on μή prohibitive with fut.
 indic., 322b. *f.*
 notice of Jebb's *Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus*,
 ed. 2, 74*f.*
 of Sidgwick's *Aeschylus, Eumenides*, 108*f.*
 Wickham (E. C.), note on Horace (*Sat.* I. vii. 10),
 40b.

Wilkins (A. S.), notice of Byrne's *Origin of the*
Greek, Latin, and Gothic Roots, 220a. *f.*
 of Roberts' *Language of Christ*, &c., 142*f.*
 of Shuckburgh's *Horace, Epistles*, I., 213b.
 Williams (H.), *Lucian's Dialogues*, translated,
 noticed, 320a. *f.*
 'Winckelmannsfeste', 264a.
 Wissowa, articles in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.* criticised
 (Angerona, Canens, Carna, Consentes, Consus,
 Dius Fidius, Faunus), 309b. *f.*
 Wohlenberg (G.), *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel* u.s.w.,
 noticed, 286a. *f.*
 Wordsworth-Sanday-White, *Old Latin Biblical Texts*,
 I. II., noticed, 276*f.*
 Wroth (W.), note on antiquities at Antwerp, 157a.
 notice of Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, Vols. II. III.,
 330a. *f.*
 of Greenwell's *Electrum Coinage of Cyzicus*,
 230a. *f.*
 Wyse (W.), notice of Borgeaud's *La Plébiscite dans*
l'Antiquité, 216a. *f.*

X.

Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, ed. Weissenborn, noticed,
 29a.
ἔμφροπός Βουλευμάτων, 74b. *f.*
 v. συμφορά.

Y.

Young (Sir G.), *Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus*, trans-
 lated, noticed, 35b. *f.*

Z.

ζήσομαι, Attic (?), 317a.
 Zeuxis, vase-painting after, 327a. *f.*
 Ziegler (Th.), letters on classical education in
 Germany, 86*f.*, 150*f.*, 182*f.*, 292*f.*
 Zitelmann (E.) v. Bücheler (F.)

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

A.

Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* (xvii. 12), 225b.

Aelius Aristides v. Aristides.

Aeschines (i. 111), 246b.

Aeschylus :—

Agam. (4), 244b.; (179—183), 243b.; (181), 244a.; (365), 79a.; (555—7), 324a.; (584), 244a.; (717), 225a.; (1036), 243b.; (1174), *ib.*; (1263), 323b.; (1601), 324a.

Choeph. (68—74), 223b.; (504), 109b.; (628), 223b.; (779—82), 244b.; (783—837), 222b.; (827), 223a.; (918), 110a.

Eumen. (8), 109b.; (30), *ib.*; (34—7), 291b.; (36), 109b.; (38), *ib.*; (40—6), 291b.; (64ff.), 109b.; (67—70), 291b.; (86, 93, 103, 115, 127, 172), 109b.; (183—4, 185—90), 292a.; (213—4, 219—221, 297—8), 292b.; (349ff.), 109b.; (361, 405, 423, 428), 110a.; (430, 432, 496, 506, 523, 599), 110b.; (635), 245a.; (645, 653, 655, 673, 726, 768, 797, 802, 803), 110b.

Pers. (829—30), 243b.

Prom. Vinc. (220), 78b.; (361), *ib.*; (488 schol.), 42b.; (501ff.), 78b.; (759), 110a.; (794), 110b.; (804), *ib.*; (835), 78b.; (859), 261b.; (969), *ib.*

Sept. (250), 323a.

Suppl. (79), 244a.; (820), 110a.

Frag. (278 Dind.), 244a.

Afranius (365), 131b.

Andocides, *De Myst.* (38), 33b.

Andronicus v. Livius Andron.

Anthol. Lat. (ed. Baehrens), 80 (3), 180b.; 211 (110), *ib.*

Antiphon, *Tetral.* (i. γ, 3), 207a.; (vi. 20), *ib.*

Apollodorus II. (5, 9), 123a.; III. (8, 2), 181a.; (10, 1), *ib.*

Apollonius Rhodius :—

I. (22), 84a.; (378—9), 83a.; II. (221, 269, 935), 84a.; III. (769), *ib.*; (854), 83b.; (1207), 84a.; (1223), 167b.; IV. (61, 1247, 1381, 1510), 84a.

Scholiast on

314 (6), 181a.; 343 (11), *ib.*; 437 (34), *ib.*

Apost. Const. vii. (2), 283a.; (8), 286b.

Aratus (825ff. schol.), 261a.

Archilochus (77), 99b.

Aristides (Aelius) :—

Orat. Rhod. I. (p. 543), 119a.

Aristophanes :—

Acharn. (170), 317b.; (318), 318a.; (401), *ib.* (426), 317b.; (541, 590, 659), 318a.; (669), 224b.; (707, 722, 823, 869, 879, 1093), 318a.

Aves (194—5), 324b.; (266 schol.), 225b.; (1498), 261a.

Nubes (6), 205b.; (35, 44, 195, 319, 330,

Aristophanes, *Nubes* (continued)—

334), 205a.; (523), 205b.; (582), 205a.; (602), 110a.; (662, 741, 880, 1366), 205a.

Lyssikl. (781—796, 803—820), 318b.; (917), 324b.

Paz (905ff.), 247a.

Plut. (64), 317b.; (114), *ib.*; (263), 317a., (277), 317b.; (332, 368), 317a.; (408), 317b.; (505, 681), 317a.; (733), 317b.; (774), 149a.; (1085, 1132), 317b.

Ran. (554), 261b.

Thesm. (811), 141a.

Vesp. (578), 247a.

Aristotle :—

Elh. Nic. viii. (9), 305a.

Hist. Anim. v. 10 (5), 97b.; viii. 2 (4), *ib.*; 3 (14), 225b.; 13 (1), 97b.; 15 (1), *ib.*; ix. 11 (2), 225b.

Oecon. ii. (4), 231a.

Politics i. 2, (p. 1252a.), 106b.; (p. 1252b.), 107a.; (p. 1253a.), 106b., 107a.; 11 (p. 1258b.), 106b.; ii. 1 (p. 1260b.), *ib.*; 2 (p. 1261a.), 107a.; (p. 1264), 34a.; 9 (p. 1269b. ff.), 107a.; 12, *ib.*; iv. 7 (p. 1293b.), 106b.; 11 (p. 1296), 107b.; vii. (Susem. on p. 1322b.), 34a.; 11 (p. 1326b.), 306a.; 13 (p. 1330a. 3), *ib.*; (p. 1332a. 7), 305b.; (p. 1335b.), 306a.

Rhet. iii. (10), 114a.

Athenaeus, *Deipnosoph.* vi. 34 (= 238c.), 80a.; vi. 54 (= 249b.), *ib.*; vi. 82 (= 263a.), *ib.*; vii. 17 (= 282d.), *ib.*; vii. 44 (= 294f.), 97b.; vii. 71 (= 305d.), 98a.; vii. 83 (= 309b.), 97b.; vii. 97 (= 315), 97b., 98a.; x. 12 (= 418b.), 80a.; xi. 109 (= 503d.), 197a.

Athenagoras (18), 8b.

Aulus Gellius v. Gellius.

Augustine, St. :—

Adv. Judaeos 11, p. m. (p. 84a.), 41b.; x. 37, *ib.*

Civ. Dei. ii. (9), 41a.; (25, 1), 41b.; iii. (13), 41a.; iv. (2), 41b.; (20, 23), *ib.*; xiv. (23, 3), *ib.*

Confess. i. (16), 226b.

De const. evang., iv. 9 (p. 1467d.), 41b.

De Trin. i. (4), 41b.; i. (8), 41a.; ii. (25), *ib.*

De du. anim. c. Manich. (§ 7), 41b.

Doctr. Chr. ii. (20), *ib.*

Epist. 222 (2), *ib.*; *Ep. Rom.* (16), *ib.*

Locutt. de gen. 21 (19), *ib.*

Quaest. in gen. (74f.), *ib.*; (142), *ib.*

Quaest. in levit. (93f.), 41a.

Quaest. in num. (5f.), 41b.

Tr. in Io. i. (7), 41b.; iii. (4) (p. 1071c.), 41a.;

xli. (1); xliii. (16) (p. 2117c.), liii. (4), lx.

(1), lxxviii. (3), lxxix. (1) (p. 2286c.), lxxxi.

(1), lxxxvii. (1) (p. 2307b.), xci. (1), xcii. (1)

(p. 2321c.), xcvi. (1), (7), xcix. (1), ci. (4),

(5), cv. (8), cvii. (4), cxii. (4), cxiii. (3), 41b.

Ep. Io. tr. 9 (10), *ib.*

B.

Bible (Old Testament Writers):—

- Genesis* iii. (19), 262b.; x. 200b.
Ezod. xxix. (39), 116b.
Levit. ix. (7), *ib.*
Job xxvi. (9), 263a.; xxxvi. (26), *ib.*
Psalms 128 (2), 283b.; 129 (7), 283a.
Eccles. i. (1), 285b.
Jerem. xxx. (17), 284a.
Ezek. xxxiv. 286b.
 (v. New Testament Writers.)

C.

Caesar:—

- Bell. Civ.* iii. (34), 282b.
Bell. Gall. i. (5. 3), 210a.; (13. 4, 14. 2, 37. 1), *ib.*; iii. (20), 80a.; (28), 80b.; vii. (15), 31a.; [Caesar], viii. (prae. 2), 326a.

Cassius Dio v. Dio Cassius.

Catullus:—

- Carm.* i. (9), vi. (7), xxi. (11), xxii. (7, 8), 70a.; (12), 85a.; xxviii. (6), 70a.; xxix. (9, 21, 23), xxxvii. (10), 70b.; xl. (5), 71a.; xli. (4), 70b.; xlii. (13), lvii. (7), lxxiii. (63), 71a.; lxiv. (22—24), 84b., 226a.; (196, 273, 287), 71a.; lxv. (9), *ib.*; lxvi. (28), 202a.; lxvii. (12, 33), 71a.; lxviii. (1 ff., 39, 68, 118, 157), *ib.*; lxxiii. (4), 71b.

Cicero:—

- Acad.* ii. (33, 107), 40a.; (34), 210b.;
Catil. i. (32), 282b.
De Nat. Deor. i. (2, 45, 54, 58, 103, 114, 116), ii. (26, 118, 125), 212a.
De Orat. iii. (7—8), 282b.
De Rep. i. (52), 253b.
Ep. ad Fam. i. (9), 253a.; v. (9), *ib.*
 „ *ad Q. Fr.* i. (2, 13), 119a.; ii. (3. 5), 40a. b.; (16), 253a.
In Ferr. ii. (5), 210b.; iii. (74), *ib.*; iv. (4, 7, 25, 30, 47, 48, 53, 56, 86, 87, 118, 119, 136, 137, 147), 210b.; v. (173), *ib.*
Orat. (46. 155), 204b.; (48. 161), 202a.; (52. 175), 114b.
Pro Caecina (18), 210b.
 „ *Cacl.* (6), 211a.
 „ *Cluent.* (13. 39), 40a. b.; (22. 61), 282b.; (44. 124), 253a.
 „ *Corn.* (1), 131b.
 „ *Flacc.* (17. 41), 40b.
 „ *Planc.* (16), 252b.; (20, 23), 253a.; (29), 253b.; (30, 31, 34), 253a.; (35), 253b.; (40), 253a.; (40), 253b.; (54), *ib.*; (55), 40b.; (55), 253a.; (77), 253b., 291a.; (83), 253a.; (90), *ib.*, 291a.; (95), 253b., 291a.
 „ *Quinc.* (83), 282b.
 „ *Rob. Post.* (5. 11), 210b.; (6. 14, 7. 18), 40b.; (8. 19), 210b.
 „ *Rege Deiot.* (39), *ib.*
 „ *Rosc. Am.* (87), 253b.
 „ *Sest.* (28), 132a.
 „ *Sull.* (31), 40a.
 „ *Tull.* (9), 282b.
Tusc. Disp. ii. (33), 211a.; v. (110), 279a.
Curtius 3, 6, (18), 25b.
Cyprian ad Demetr. (12), 41b.

D.

Demosthenes:—

- I. [*Olynth.* i.] (1, 19), 208a.; (21), 207b.

Demosthenes, continued—

- II. [*Olynth.* ii.] (2, 20, 23, 28), *ib.*; (30), 207a.
 III. [*Olynth.* iii.] (12), 208a.; (30, 33), 207b.
 IV. [*Phil.* i.] (7), 207a.; (15, 32, 35, 38, 44, 50), 207b.
 VIII. [*Chers.*] (27), *ib.*
 XIX. [*De Fals.*] (26), 114a.; (74 = p. 364), 75b.; (123 = p. 379), *ib.*; (181), 324b.; (251 = p. 420), 241b., 290b.
 XX. [*Lep.*] (107), 34a.
 XXI. [*Meid.*] (49), 33b.
 XXIII. [*Aristocr.*] (20), *ib.*; (66), 42b.; (117), 322b.
 LIII. [*Nicostr.*] (14), 246b.
 [Demosthenes].
 XLVI. [*Steph.* ii.] (9), 247a.
 LIX. [*Naeer.*] (90f.), 247b.
Didache.
 I. (2), 287a.; (3ff.), 286b., 287a.; iv. (8), 286b.; xv. (3, 4), 286a.; xvi. (1), 286b.
Didascalia.
 ii. 1, (3, 13), 81b.; iv. (1), *ib.*; vi. (4, 9), *ib.*
Digest. 22, 5 (l. 3, § 2), 40b.
 Dio Cassius.
 liii. (17), 289a.; lvii. (8), 165b.; lviii. (8), 289a.
 Dio Halicarn. i. (32), 180b.
 Diodorus xi. (33), 113b.
 Diog. Laert.
 i. (62), 241a.; ii. (46), 197a.; vii. (130), 279a.; x. (6, 11), 279b.; (16, 28, 36), 279a.; (40), 278b.; (49, 113, 119), 279a.; (124), 278b.; (140, 145, 146), 279b.; (152), 278b.
 Dionysius Perieg. (517, Eustath. on), 123a.

E.

- Ennius, *Ann.* (34), 130a.; (148), 129b.; (479), 130a.
 Euripides:—
Alcest. (728), 245b.
Androm. (450), 324a.
Bacch. (145), 224a.; (506, 677), 224b.; (730), 225a.; (734—745), 224b.; (859), *ib.*; (896), 114a.; (943), 224b.; (962), 324a.; (1005), 224b.; (1060, 1163, 1174), 225a.; (1302), 245b.
Elect. (467), 244b.; (810ff.), 139a.; (1258), 42b.
Hecuba (68), 42a.; (357), 243b.; (788), 42a.
Heracl. (90—2), 31b.; (163, 990), 243b.
Herc. Fur. (221), 243b.
Hippol. (560), 101b.; (1032—5, 1034), 243a.
Ion (75), 243b.; (120—4), 225a.; (184), 328a.; (206, 220), 328b.; (317—320, 552, 576—80), 225a.; (964), 244a. (1074), 244b.; 1601—3, 42a.
Iph. Aul. (722—4), 262a.; (1431), 245b.
Med. (718), 243b.; (822), 323a.
Orest. (275), 224b.
Phoen. (194f.), 42a.; (1482), 328a.; (1590), 76b.; (1693, 1697), 328a.
Rhes. (918), 243b.; (980), 149a.
Supp. (1196), 318b.
Tro. (990), 245b.; (1055—7), 243a.
frag. (63 Dind.), 243b.; (593 Dind.), 244b.
 Eusebius [*Præp. Evang.* (767 E), 279b.

F.

- Festus (19), 204b.; (64), 131b.; (205), 204b.
 v. Paulus.

G.

Gellius (Au.), iv. (16), 273b.; ix. (14), 132a.; x. (15), 322b.
Gorgias, *Helen* (2), 114a.
Gregory Tyr. *Glor. Mart.* i. (5f.), 41b.

H.

Harpocration (s. v. *Γερμασία*), 113b.; (s. v. *γραφὴ ῥη-
τορικῆς*), 247a.; (s. v. *ναυροδίκαι*), 34a.
Heliodorus, *Aeth.* iii. (8), 225b.
Hermas, *Pastor* :—
 Mand. ii. 284b., 285a. b.; xii. (4. 8), 252a.
 Sim. ii. 284b.; viii. (4. 8), 252a.; ix. (5. 2),
 263a.; (15. 1), 252a.; (17), 285b.; (24), 284b.;
 (30. 3), 252a. b.; x. (4. 5), 252b.
 Vis. i. (3. 3), 263a.; iii. (9. 1), *ib.*
Herodotus :—
 i. (29), 242b.; ii. (82), 197b.; (177), 241b., 242b.,
 290b.; iv. (157—9), 200b.; v. (113), 199a.; vi.
 (86), 200b.; (130), 34a.; vii. (1), 79b.; (139,
 160), 113b.; viii. (11, 3, **25**, **1**), 79b.; ix. (27),
 113b.
Hesiod :—
 Asp. Herac. (71, 153), 102b.
 Op. et D. (11), 197a.; (167), 198a.; (282), 200b.;
 (326), 102b.; (387), 102a.; (504), 197b.; (504
 —563), *ib.*; (564—618), *ib.*; (635—9), 196b.;
 (655), 197b.; (663, 675), 198a.; (731), 197b.;
 (733), 102b.; (742), 197b.
 Theog. (54), 197a.; (60), 198a.; (102), 242a.;
 (225), 197a.; (328—345), 197b.; (360), 198a.;
 (411—452), 197b.; (480), 198a.; (538—540,
 638, 639), *ib.*; (683), 102b.; (706), 42a.;
 (720—815), 197b.; (737, 788, 808, 852), 102b.;
 (860), 196b.
Hieronymus, *Ep.* 82 (4), 41b.
 Ep. ad Dam. (146), 226b.
Hilary in *Matt.* v. (1), 41a.
Hippoxax (*fr.* 38), 225b.
Homer :—
 Hymns.
 i. (*Apoll.*), (169ff.), 200a.; i. [ii.] (247), 198b.,
 iii. (*Herm.*), (185), 102a.; iv. (*Aphrod.*), (13,
 55ff.), 199a.; (147), 102a.; v. (*Demet.*), (209),
 199b.; viii. (*Arct.*), (59, 60, 363), 199a.; xix.
 (*Pan.*), (14—16), 31a.
 Iliad.
 i. (54), 175a.; (330, Eustath. on), 279b.; ii. (145),
 101a.; (354—6), 323b.; (746), 101a.; iii.
 (346, 376), 232a.; v. (16), 100b.; (284), 76b.;
 (293), 175a., (315), 101a.; (385ff.), 222a.;
 (390), 175a. (487), 101b., 175a. (575—9),
 256b.; vi. (297), 174b.; (454), 149a.; vii. (119,
 174), 101a.; (277, 285, 424), 175a.; viii.
 (166, 481), *ib.*; ix. (124), 115a.; (219),
 101a.; (299), 175a.; (615), 174b.; x. (91),
 31a.; (107, 246), 101a.; (285), 175a.; (329),
 324b.; (373), 175a.; (501), 101a.; (566), 100b.;
 xi. (35 schol.), 100a.; (89), 101a.; (340) 100a.;
 xii. (52), 174b.; xiii. (494), 101b.; (656—9), 256b.;
 xiii. (796), 42a.; xv. (36), 324b.; xvi. (74), 100b.;
 (235), 322b.; (777ff.), 260a.; xvii. (189, 667),
 101a.; xix. (56), 100b.; (73), 101a.; xx. (5),
 ib.; (85—6), 100b.; xxi. (198), 42a.; (422),
 101a.; xxiii. (69), 325a.; (340, 431), 101a.;
 (789), 149a.; xxiv. (416), 101a.
 Odyssey.
 i. (56f.), 260b.; ii. (308 schol.), 222a.; ii.
 (340), 12a.; (340), 12b.; iii. (391), 12a.; (391),
 12b.; v. (60), 12a.; (60), 12b.; vi. (201), 179a.;
 viii. (360), 12a.; (360), 12b.; (362ff.), 199a.;
 ix. (43), 179a.; (57, 491), 175b.; x. (106,

Homer, *Odyssey* (continued)—

116), 31a.; (168), 12b.; (227), 290a.; (517),
34a.; xi. (278, 634), 12b.; xii. (94), 12b.;
xvii. (8), 12a.; (8), 12b.; (418), 205b.; (476),
108b.; xxi. (4, 113—6, 302), 35b.; xxiii.
(3), 109b.; (296), 12a.; xxiv. (124), 12a.;
(124), 12b.

Cypria, 9, 4 (Kinkel), 199a.

Horace :—

Odes.

I. (iii. 7), 72a.; (iv. 16), 73b.; (vii. 1—20), 31a.,
(20), 73b.; (21, 36), 31a.; (ix. 24), 73a.;
(xi. 6, xiv. 20, xv. 24, xvii. 9, xx. 10, xxiii.
1), 72a.; (xxv. 2), 72b.; (xxvi. 3), 73a.;
(xxviii. 3, 26), 17b.; (xxxv. 17), 72b.; II. (ii.
6), 73b.; (iii. 36), 31b.; (vii. 22), 73a.; (ix.
7), 17b.; (xviii. 14), 73a.; (xx. 6), 73b.; (13),
72b.; III. (iii. 10, 38), 72b.; (v. 40), 73a.;
(vi. 41f.), 261a.; (vii. 4), 132a.; (viii. 18),
73a.; (x. 17), 72a.; (xi. 16—20), 73a.; (xiv.
11), 72b.; (xxiv. 4, xxix. 6, 34), *ib.*; (xxx.
10), 17b.; (xxxiii. 3), 73b.; IV. (ii. 2), 73a.;
(27), 17b.; (29), 73a.; (49), 72b.; (iv. 65),
ib.; (v. 33), 85a.; (viii. 13), 73a.; (ix. 2), 17b.;
(xi. 1ff.), 31a.; (xiii. 21), 73b.; (xiv. 25), 17b.
Epod. (ii. 1, 102), 17b.; (iii. 16), 14b.; (xvi. 28),
17b.
Sat. I. (iii. 65), 253a.; (138), 228b.; (v. 57),
70b.; (vi. 92), 227b.; (vii. 10—11), 40b.; (14,
18), 41a.; II. (i. 50), *ib.*; (viii. 59), 282b.
Epist. I. (xvi. 8, xviii. 93, xx. 19, 28), 213b.
Hyginus, *Astron.* II. (1, 21), 181a.

I.

Iamblichus, *Protrept.* (p. 130), 226a.

Inscriptions :—

Collections.

Bull. Corr. Hell. xi. (160), 289a. ff.

Bull. Epigr. vi. (6), 273a.

CLA. i. (277), 38b.; (465), 100a.; ii. (578),
247b.

CIG. I. (pp. 11, 731), 33b.; (1513b.), *ib.*; (2445),
325b.; ii. (p. 97ff.), 33b.

CIL. I. (1, 13, 45), 202a.; (47), 130a.; (48), 203a.,
(54), 130b.; (57), 130a.; (62), 276a.; (63)
202a., 274b.; (64, 168), 130a., (173), 131a.,
276b.; (174), 203a.; (181), 276b.; (183), 130a.,
(187), 276a.; (191, 196, 2), 130a.; (198), 275a.,
(199), 204a., b., 274b., 275b.; (206), 275a.;
(297), 131b.; (562), 276a.; (584), 273a.; (807),
276a.; (813), 130a.; (842, 656), 202a.; (1008),
276a.; (1149, 1175), 204a.; (1200), 276a.;
(1275), 204a.; (1469), 276a.; (1553), 204a.
vi. (7723), 227a.

Eph. Arch. 1887 (p. 5), 328a.

Eph. Epigr. I. (6), 130a.; (8), 275b.; II. (298),
275a., 276a.; (299), 274a.

Mommson, IRN. (4916, 5237), 14b.

Orelli (650), 130b.

Roehl, Imag. (p. 68), 146a.

„ *IGA.* (46, 105 add., 107, 113a.), 146b.;
(471 add.), 146a.

Zvetiaieff, Inscr. It. Inf. Dial.

(8), 130a. b., 131a. b., 274b., 276a. b.; (9),
202b.; (10), 202b., 275a., 276b.; (11), 129b.,
202b., 203a., 275b.; (13), 130a. b., 204a. b.,
274b., 275a. b., 276a. b., 277a.; (14), 130b.,
202b., 204b., 205a., 276a. b.; (15), 202b.; (16),
277b.; (17, 19), 202b.; (20), 277a.; (23), 276a.,
(25), 131a., 202b., 276a.; (28), 132b.; (33),
130b., 204a., 277a.; (34), 204b.; (35), 130b.,
131a., 204b., 277a.; (39), 202b., 274b.; (40),
274b.; (48), 130b., 202b.; (47), 202b., 203b.,

Inscriptions, *Zvetiaeff (continued)*—

204a. b., 275b.; (49), 203a.; (50, 55), 129b.; (60), 202b.; (61), 203b.; (62), 202b., 203a., 276a.; (70), 130b., 202b., 203b., 273a., 276a.; (73), 203a.; (75, 76), 202b.; (81), 130a., 274b., (82), 202b., 274b.; (83), 202a., 277a.; (87), 130b.; (87A), 129b., 130b., 132b., 203a. b., 204b., 276a.; (87A.B.), 274b., 275b.; (87B.), 131a. b., 202a.; (89), 130b., 132b.; (93), 203b.; (100), 275b.; (107), 202a.; (108), 276a.; (110), 204a.; (112), 274b.; (128B), 203b.; (129), 132b., 203a. b., 275a. b., 276a. b., 277a.; (135), 202b.; (136), 129b., 130b., 202a. b., 203a. b., 204a. b., 273a., 275a. b., 276a. b.; (137), 203b.; (138), 275b.; (140), 276b.; (142), 131b., 274b., 275a., 276a.; (143), 130a., 132b., 202a. b., 276b.; (146), 132b.; (148), 274b.; (156a.), 276a.; (160, 161), 275a.; (161), 202a.; (172), 276b.; (231), 129b., 130a. b., 131a., 132a., 202a., 203a. b., 204a., 273a. b., 274b., 276a. b., 277a. b.; (238), 274b.; (247), 202a.; (253), 129b., 276b.; (257, 259, 272, 276, 278, 280), 204a.; (581), 276b.

Miscellaneous :—

Columna Rostr., 204b., 273a., 275a. b., 276b.
'*Dreinos*,' 203a., 204b., 276a.
Ep. Scip., 203a., 204a. b., 276b.
Monum. Ancyr., 131b., 168b.
Monum. Mogvad. (169, 262, *Jaffé*), 41b.
'*Numasios*,' 202a., 203a.
S. C. de Bacch., 130b., 131a., 202a., 204a., 273a. b., 276a. b.
'*spoleta*,' 274a.
Tab. Ig., I. A. (1), 131b.; I. B. (7), 129b., 202b.; (8), 129b.; (14), 130b.; (27), 129b., 131b.; (31, 42), 131b.; II. A. (5), 274a.; (9), 129b.; (16), 131a.; (22, 28), 202b.; (38), 274a.; (42), 129b.; (43), 202b.; II. B. (15), 276a.; (23), 274a.; (24), 274b.; III. (10), 131a.; IV. (2), 275a.; V. A. (2, 4, 5), 132b.; (6), 275a.; (9), 276a.; (15), 132b.; (23), 203b.; v. B. (9), 202b.; (13, 16), 129b.; VI. A. (1), 131b., 275b.; (8), 274b.; (10), 203b.; (19), 202b.; (54), 274b., 275a.; VI. B. (3), 204b.; (4), 202b.; (5, 17, 25), 129b.; (38), 274b.; (43), 204b.; (47), 129b., 204b.; (50), 203b.; (55, 61), 275a.; VII. A. (3), 204b.; (6), 129b.; (43), 204b.; (51), 275a.; VII. B. (2), 131a. b., 204a.; (3), 202b.
Umbr. Inscr. (1), 202b., 274a. b.; (2), 273b., 276a.; (3), 202b.

Isocrates :—

Areop. (149 C), 141a.
De Antid. (71), 112a.
Epitaph. (2, 5, 16, 23, 29, 31, 34, 37, 40, 41, 42, 50, 54, 60, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77), 114a.
Paneg. (40), 42b.; (186), 114a.
Irenaeus adv. H. iv. (1), 263a.; (26, 1), 41b.; (35, 3), 263a.; vii. (2), *ib.*
Isidore Origines, v. (23), 40b.; xix. (29, 3), 82b.

J.

Johannes Malalas v. Malalas.
Josephus, Ant. xx. (11, 2), 142b.
Justin xviii. (5), 322a.
Juvenal i. (158), 326b.; (165) 73b.; v. (147), 23a.; vi. (628), 326b.; vii. (203), 80b.; x. (8, 34, 346), 326b.; xi. (106), 85b.; xiv. (24), 326b.

L.

Laertius v. Diog. Laert.
Livius Andronicus (ap. Non, p. 493), 131b.

Livy v. (10, 4, 33, 11, 38, 1), 214a.; vii. (42), 217b.; xxi. (53, 6), 27a.; xxiii. (5, 12), 229a.; xxv. (5, 8), 38a.; xxxviii. (57), 87b.
Longinus, Act. Rhet. (137), 85a.
Lucan, Phars. i. (313), 73b.; ix. (182), 16b.
Lucian, Philopseud. (13), 167b.; (20), 262b.
Lucilius (vii. *fr.* 6), 132a.; (*l.* 228), *ib.*; (ix. 317ff), 203a.
Lucretius i. (446), 273b.; ii. (124), 274b.; iii. (736), 40a.; iv. (568), 226a.; (1075), 132a.
Lycophron (857, 994), 101b.
Lydus v. Priscianus Lydus.
Lysias vi. (29), 247a.; (33), 141a.; vii. (2, 22, 24, 29, 34, 39), 114b.; xvi. (7, 15), 115a.; xix. (23, 62), *ib.*; xxiii. (3), *ib.*; xxix. (7), 322b.; *fr.* (44 S), 246a.

M.

Macrobius, Sat. iii. 5 (7), 82b.
Malalas (Johannes), 97 (19), 209b.
Martial vii. 95 (9), 326b.; ix. 72 (1ff.), 37a., 149b.; x. 70 (13), 37a.
Meleager, F. 4 (583), 181a.; H. 3 (90), 9 (156), *ib.*; M. 5 (504), 6 (119), 7 (17), *ib.*
Menander, Mon., (572), 323a.
Moschus ii. (61, 68, 70, 123), 13b.; iv. (37, 73, 124), *ib.*

N.

New Testament Writers :—

St. Matthew iii. (9), 314a.; v. (11), 313b., 314a.; (13), 314a.; (39), 287a.; vi. (19), 314a.; vii. (19, 26), 323a.; viii. (5, 50), 27b.; x. (29), 181b.; xi. (23), 313b.; xiv. (22), 143b.; xix. (19), 263a.; xxiii. (36), 27b.; xxvi. (45), 227b., 325a.
St. Mark ii. (14), 313a.; (17, 21), 314b.; iv. (39), 314a.; vi. (45), 143b.; vii. (19), 28a.; viii. (36), *ib.*; ix. (15), 27b.; xiv. (41), 227b.; xv. (31, 36), 28a.; xvi. (17), 116a.
St. Luke ii. (36), 227a.; vi. (27-35), 286b.; (30, 39), 287a.; viii. (25), 28a.; xi. (24), *ib.*; xii. (35), 286b.; xiii. (19), 314b.; xxii. (38), 325a.; (45), 227b.; xxiii. (11), 313a.
St. John i. (32, 48), 314a.; ii. (2), *ib.*; (3), 313b.; (9, 15, 22), 314a.; iii. (1, 6), *ib.*; (25), 314b.; v. (4), 313b.; xi. (31, 44), 28a.
Acts of Apost. ii. (4), 116a.; iv. (32), 287a.; xiii. (9), 227a.
Romans xi. (31), 116a.; xv. (14), *ib.*
I. Corinthians v. (9), 116a.; vii. (21), *ib.*; x. (4), *ib.*; xi. (10, 24), *ib.*; xiv. *ib.*; xv. (29, 31), *ib.*
Ephesians iv. (28), 262b., 285a.
Hebrews x. (13), 325a.
St. James i. (5), 285a.
St. Peter ii. 2 (13), 286b.
Nonius (Müller's pp.), (7, 19), 316a.; (12, 18), *ib.*; (15, 7), 316a. f.; (15, 14), 316b.; (74, 6), 316a.; (80, 31), 315b.; (493), 131b.

O.

Orientius, Comm. i. (120, 178, 217), 20b.; (377), 21a.; (390-440, 405), 263b.; (535), 21a.; (548), 20b.; ii. (184), 21b., (216), 21a.; (336), 263b.; vi. (23), *ib.*; vii. (14-26), *ib.*
Ovid :—
Am. iii. 10 (47), 85a.
Ep. xvi. (229), 39a.; xxi. (91), 85a.
Fast. ii. (637), *ib.*; iii. 85b.

Ovid, continued—

- Pont.* III. (viii. 3), 180b.
Trist. I. (iv. 1), *ib.*; (v. 26, vii. 7, xi. 15), 180b.; II. (357), 181a.; III. (iv. 47), 180b.; IV. (i. 7), *ib.*; V. (iii. 7), *ib.*; (v. 11), 85a.

P.

Paul. ex Fest. (ed. Müller), (pp. 45, 47), 82b.

Pausanias I. (vii. 8), 137b.; III. (xv. 7), 222a.; V. (xxv. 3), 180a.; VII. (xxv. 3), 325a.; VIII. (xxvii.), 107a.; (xxxiii. 4), 123a.; X. (xxxviii. 11), 197a.

Persius iii. (29), 85a.

Pindar.—

- Isth.* i. (21), 99a.; ii. (10), 180a.
Nem. vii. (42), 101b.; ix. (55), 99b.; (131) 99a.
Ol. i. (3), 290a.; ii. (95), 242b., 245a.; iii. (32), 99b.; vi. (82), 139b.; xiii. (34), 99b.; (48), 99a.
Pyth. i. (1), 324a.; (92) 118b.; xii. (24), 99a.
frag. (138), 101b.

Plato.—

- Apol.* (17 A, D), 28b.; (19 E), 76a.; (25 D), 76b.; (26 D, 26 E), 28b.; (32 B), 247a.
Cratyl. (390 D, 406 B, 407 B, 409, 410 C, D, 411 B, 412, 424 A, 435 C), 206a.
Critias (117 A—B), 229b.
Crito (43 C, 44 B), 177a.; (44 C), 176b.; (44 D) 176a.; (44 E, 45 B), 177a.; (46 D, 47 B, 48 A, C), 176b.; (49 B, 50 B), 177a.; (50 E, 51 B) 176b.; (51 D, 52 C), 177a.; (53 A, D), 176b.; (53 E), 176b.; (53 E), 177a.; (54 A), 176b.; (54 A), 177a.
Euthyd. (275 B, 287 D), 228b.
Gorgias (494 B), 225b.
Hipp. Maj. (283 A, 289 A), 228a.
Legg. ii. (672 C), 109b.; xi. (934 E), xii. (964b.), 141a.
Meno (74 D, 76 E, 81 B, 84 A, 86 D, E, 91 B), 28b.
Parmen. (137 A), 115b.
Phaedo (94 D), 140b.; (96 A—100 B), 206b.; (104 A), 228b.; (106 D), 323a.
Phaedr. (234 B, 241 A, 245 D), 228b.; (257 D), 208b.; (264 B), 323a.; (266 C), 228b.; (274 B—278 D), 206b.
Phileb. (44 D), 228a.
Polit. (262 E), 228b.
Protag. (115), *ib.*
Repub. (353), 139a.; (420 E), 28b.; (498 A), 324b.; (584 C), 228b.; (586 C), 229a.; (600), 228b.; (600 A, 607 B), 229a.
Sophist. (223 B), 229b.; (259 C), 111b.
Sympos. (183 E, 223 D), 228a.
Timaeus (25 C), 176a.; (74 E), 228b.
Theaet. (182 A, 201 C), *ib.*
Theag. (125 A), *ib.*

Plautus.—

- Amphit.* (1072), 326a.
Bacch. (34), 178a.; (62), 273b.; (793), 220a.
Capt. (1, 10, 11, 13, 63, 68, 80, 89, 92, 124, 162, 173, 218, 219, 278, 279, 304, 317, 335, 339), 178a.; (392), 23a.; (433, 471, 476, 636, 657, 683, 714), 178a.; (754, 783, 813, 852, 871, 928, 952, 1005), 178b.
Carin. (Prolog. 20. 34), 22b.; (124, 126), *ib.*; (157, 207, 221), 23a.; (326), 21b.; (502, 503, 506), 22a.; (663, 687, 763), 23a.; (788, 883), 21b.; (888, 896), 23a.; (932), 21b.
Cist. (260, 267, 311, 362, 385, 397), 23b.
Men. (494), 132a.
Mil. Glor. (103), *ib.*; (215), 23a.; (374), 204a.; (410), 276b.; (877), 178a.

Plantus, continued—

- Most.* (116), *ib.*; (885), 23b.; (947), 203b.
Pers. (174), 23b.
Poen. (i. 2, 64), 23a.; (iii. 4, 13), 39b.; (iii. 5, 33), 23b.
Rud. (789), 23a.; (829), 178a.; (848), 23b.
Stich. (71), 276b.
Trin. (ii. 1, 1=223), 22b.; (ii. 1. 22=251), 129b.
Truc. (892), 23b.
Pliny, *H. N.*, ii. (1), 226b.; (22), 310b.; ix. (24), 98a.; xxxiii. (69), 210b.; xxxv. (63), 327a.; xxxvi. (39), 210b.
Pliny, *Epist.* II. (xiv. 4), 37a.; VI. (v. 2), 40b.; VII. (iv.), 289b.; VIII. (i.), 26b.

Plutarch.—

- Moral.* (1097 B), 279b.
Sympos. (v. 7, p. 681), 225b.
Vita Andoc. (834 E), 247b.
" C. Gracch. (5), 38a.
" Cim. (6), 254b.
" Lucull. (28), 84a.
" Nic. (1, 3), 208b.
" Orat. (851 F), 247b.
" Solon. (14—15), 241a.; (16), *ib.* 290b.
" Sulla. (26), 84a.

Pollux viii. (85), 34a.; xxiii. (26), 238b.
Polybius II. (xxxix. 6), 319a.; III. (lviii. 9), 319b.; (lxxxii. 10), 319a.; (cx. 8), 16a.; (cxiii. 5), 320a.; (cxvii. 3), 319b.; V. (xciii. 10), 319a.; VI. (xix. 2), 38a.; IX. (xxiv.), 226a.
Priscian i. (p. 32 Hertz), 215a.; (30), (132b.); (40), 130b.; vi. (17), 276a.; vii. (9), 130a., 131a.; (347), 276a.; xi. (17K, 77K), 203a.
Priscianus Lydus (ii. 32, iii. 20, iv. 12, 28, 32, v. 17, xix. 3, xxxvi. 26), 18a.
Propertius I. (i. 33), 38b.; (xvi. 22), 39b.; (xvii. 3), 38b.; II. (xxviii. 25, xxx. 19-22, xxxii. 23), *ib.*; III. (i. 23-34, *ib.*; (xiii. 1-4, xvi. 19, xvii. 3), 39a.; (xvii. 38), 85a.; IV. (iii. 7, iv. 47-50), 39a.; (vi. 79), 39b.; (vi. 85), 85a.; (vii. 21, 55-60), 39b.

Q.

Quaestiones ad Antioch. (88), 262b.
Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* X. (iii. 23), 226b.

S.

Sallust.—

- Bell. Civ.* (28), 282a.
Catil. (ii. 3, xi. 7), 26b.; (xviii. 5, xxii. 2), 25b.; (xxiii. 4), 26b.; (xxxvii. 5), 26a.; (l. 4), 25b.; (lii. 4), 26b.; (lix. 3), 25b.
Jugurth. (xxxi. 25), 26a.; (liii. 5), 26a., 39b.; (lx. 3), 39b.; (lxxxv. 31, lxxxix. 5, xciii. 3, 8, xcvi. 5, civ. 2, cviii. 2, cxiv. 2), 26a.

Scholiasts v. *sub resp.* authors.

Seneca (An.).—

Controv. vii. (17, 9), ix. (24, 13), 282b.

Seneca (L.).—

- Apocol.* (ii. 24, v. 36, vi. 15, xi. 19, xii. 10, 11, xv.), 181b.
Ep. M. i. (5, 4), 253a.
Ep. (36, 7), 282b.; (81, 4), 254a.

Servius.—

- Commentary on Aen.* i. (550), 41b.; ix. (309, 360), x. (402, 575), 42a.; *Ecl.* i. (69); ii. (8, 46), iii. (77), v. (5, 37), vi. (7, 26, 32), vii. (24, 33), 82b.; *Georg.* iii. (122, 148), iv. (448), *ib.*; iv. (484), 85b.

Silius Italicus i. (568), 227a.

Simocatta v. Theophylactus.

Simonides (75, 85, 99), 99b.

Sirach vii. (30), 287a.

Sophocles:—

- Ajax* (50), 84a.; (572), 323a.; (647), 249f., (1237, 1281), 205b.
Antig. (40), 139a.; (106, 112), 249b.; (117 f.), 262a.; (126), 141a.; (149), 249b.; (178), 250a.; (231), 140a.; (263), 249b.; (340), 250a.; (343), 141a.; (350), 140b.; (351), 249b.; (361), 250a.; (390), 140a.; (392), 249b.; (450-457), 225a.; (465-468), 140a.; (466 f.), 250a.; (514), 249b.; (537), 140b.; (567), 249b.; (572), 250a.; (578), 249b.; (599-602), 139a.; (606), 141a.; (611), 250a.; (614), 141a.; (648), 140b.; (718), 250a.; (782-9), 224a.; (782-90), 261b.; (790), 249b.; (857), 141b.; (904-20), 140a.; (952), 250a.; (967), 141b.; (972 f.), 980, 982, 250a.; (1102), 141a.; (1119), 250a.; (1147), 244b.; (1165), 140b.; (1178), 75a.; (1232), 141b.; (1280), 140b.
Electra (17-19), 244a.; (841), 109b.; (1063), 42a.
Oed. Col. (95), 141b.; (113), 141b.; (161), 141a.; (243, 278, 321), 141b.; (454), 75a.; (541), 141a.; (656), 76b.; (1226), 141b.; (1460, 1466), 42a.; (1506), 74b.; (1584), 141b.; (1604), 42a.; (1632), 141b.
Oed. Tyr. (44), 74b., 148b.; (46, 87), 36a.; (155, 185), 75a.; (195, 218), 36a.; (220), 75a.; (300), 36b.; (314, 316), 76a.; (326, 337, 368), 36b.; (380, 420), 76a.; (428, 445, 455), 36b.; (483), 141a.; (525, 615), 36b.; (690), 76a.; (742, 811, 846), 36b.; (866), 262a.; (910), 36b.; (1093, 1218), 141a.; (1800), 262a.; (1350), 141b.; (1451), 76a.; (1455), 76b.; (1458), 36b.; (1529), 76b.
Philoct. (22), 249a.; (41 f.), 324b.; (79), 323a.; (182), 249a.; (258, 294), 141b.; (297), 249b.; (362), 249a.; (611), 76b.; (910), 249a.; (1003, 1060), 249b.; (1327), 123a.; (1459), 249b.
frag. (858, 945 Dind.), 324b.
 Statius, *Silv.* III. i. (55), 311a.
 Stobaeus:—
Eclog. II. vi. (17), 105b.
Flor. xvii. (14), 279a.
 Strabo ii. (70), 84a.; v. (236), vi. (257, 281), vii. (290), 84b.; xi. (515), 84a.; xiii. (590, 690), 84b.; xvii. (812), 297a.
 Suetonius:—
Caes. (41), 170b.
Calig. (12), 289a.
Jul. (48), 326b.; (56), 326a.
Oct. (87), 273a.

T.

Tacitus:—

- Agric.* (1), 226b.
Ann. i. (3), 289a.; (52, 53, 61), 27a.; ii. (1), 141b.; (23), 227a.; (64), 27a.; iii. (19), 289a.; (74), 27a.; iv. (68), 141b.
Germ. (7, 23), 25b.
Hist. iii. (9, 24), 27a.; iv. (34), 226a.

Terence:—

- Eunuch.* (519), 203b.
Hecyr. (225), 253a.
Phorm. (9), 24b.; (21), 24a.; (39, 43, 64,

Terence, *Phorm.* (continued)—

- 72, 92, 102, 137, 154, 155, 159), 24b.; (190), 24a.; (212, 226, 231, 297, 315, 320, 330), 24b.; (390), 24a.; (426, 484, 502, 506, 508, 519), 24b.; (550), 24a.; (556), 25a.; (586, 624, 663, 713, 723, 724), 24b.; (728, 735), 24a.; (741, 746, 768, 771), 25a.; (772, 798), 24a.; (804, 820, 822, 848, 917, 923), 25a.; (934), 24a.; (943, 973, 978, 1015, 1028), 25a.; (1038), 24a.

Theocritus i. (128, 162), 13b.; iv. (16), 22b.; (18), 13b.; v. (61), 249b.; vii. (130), 265b.; (schol. ad loc.), 141b.; xvi. (99), xxv. (257), 13b.

Theognis (253, 440, 957), 99b.

Theophylactus Simocatta ii. (11), 29b.; vii. (4), 209b.; (16), 29b.

Thucydides i. (23), 75a.; (118), 323a.; (131), 254b.; (140), 74b.; ii. (3, 4), 119a.; (9), 255a.; (24, 2), 318a.; (75, 6), 119a.; (76), 261b.; iii. (23), 119b.; (104), 200a.; v. (4, 8), vi. (2), 180a.; (4), 180b.; (11), 180a.; vii. (57), 141b.; (68, 1), 207a.; (71, 3, 4, 73, 2), 39b.; viii. (97), 107b.

Tibullus I. (i. 1), 180b.; II. (i. 88), 244b.; IV. (vi. 14), 85a.

V.

Valerius Maximus II. (ii. 3), 142a.; (x. 8), 312a.

Varro L. L. v. (66), 309b.; vi. (36), 216b.; x. (50), 41b.

Sat. Men. (3), 274a.

Sat. (26), 275b.

Virgil:—

Aen. i. (257), 273b.; (293 f.), 222a.; (367 f.), 322a.; (592), 180b.; (636), 132a.; ii. (241), 282b.; iv. (224-5), 226a.; (464), 69b.; (625-629), 68b.; v. (124-8), 69a.; (432), 274a.; vi. (653), 274a.; vii. (279), 180b.; (563-71), 14a.; (611 f.), 222a.; ix. (615), 24b.; (721), 226a.; x. (512), 282b.; (562), 180b.; xii. (709), 215a.

Eclog. i. (5), 212b.; (55, 66, 70), 213a.; ii. (1, 2, 30), 141b.; iii. (39, 102), 141b.; iv. (30, 44), 141b.; v. (60), 212b.; v. (39), 15a.; (40), 213a.; (77), 22b.; (80), 213a.; vi. (5, 35), 141b.; vii. (1, 5), 141b.; viii. (12, 38), 212b.; (42, 59, 77), 213a.; ix. (23, 58), 141b.; x. (20), 141b.

Georg. I. (254), iv. (305), 227a.

Virgil, Servius, *Commentary on, v. Servius.*

Vitruvius II. (i. 6), 85a.

X.

Xenophon:—

- Anab.* II. (ii. 5), 325a.; IV. (i. 7), 224b.; (viii. 2), 115a.; (viii. 14), 226b.; VI. (ii. 24), 28b.
De Rep. Ath. (iii. 2, 4), 247a.
Hellen. II. (ii. 2), 176a.; (iv. 36), 115a.; III. (iii. 6), 226b.
Memorab. I. (i. 7), 29a.; II. (iii. 8), 177a.; IV. (viii. 9), 177b.
Pect. iv. (14), 33b.

Z

Zenobius ii. (65), 324b.

Messrs. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S LIST.

COMPLETION OF MR. LEAF'S EDITION OF "THE ILIAD."

THE ILIAD.—Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by WALTER LEAF, Litt. D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 2 vols. 8vo, 14s. each. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. Vol. II. XIII.—XXIV. (Classical Library.)

KTESIAS.—The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. Edited with Introduction and Notes by JOHN GILMORE, M.A. 8vo, 8s. 6d. (Classical Library.)

PLINY.—Letters to Trajan. Edited, with Notes and Introductory Essays, by E. G. HARDY, M.A., formerly Head Master of the Grammar School, Grantham. 8vo. (Classical Library.) *[Immediately.]*

THE WORKS OF XENOPHON. Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes, by H. G. DAKYNS, M.A. Four Vols. Crown 8vo. *[Vol. I. in January.]*

POLYBIUS.—Complete Works. Translated by E. S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A. Two Vols. Crown 8vo. *[In the press.]*

A COMPANION TO SCHOOL CLASSICS. By JAMES GOW, M.A., Litt.D., Head Master of Nottingham High School, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s. *[Second Edition, revised, in the press.]*

ANCIENT ROME IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES. By RODOLFO LANCIANI, LL.D. (Harv.), Professor of Archaeology in the University of Rome; Director of Excavations for the National Government and the Municipality of Rome, &c. With 100 Illustrations. Small 4to, 24s.

AESCHYLUS.—Seven against Thebes. School Edition. Edited by A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and M. A. BAYFIELD, M.A., Assistant Master at Malvern College. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d. (Classical Series.)

SELECTIONS FROM THE ATTIC ORATORS.—Antiphon Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus. Edited, with Notes, by R. C. JEBB, LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. (Classical Series.)

PLATO.—The Republic. Books I.—V. Edited by T. H. WARREN, M.A., President of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. (Classical Series.)

AN INTRODUCTION TO LATIN LYRIC VERSE COMPOSITION. By Rev. J. H. LUPTON, M.A., Surmaster at St. Paul's School, author of "An Introduction to Latin Elegiac Verse Composition." Globe 8vo, 3s.; Key, 4s. 6d.

ANALECTA: Passages for Translation. Selected by JOHN S. STRACHAN, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge; A. S. WILKINS, Litt.D., LL.D., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. Professors in Owens College, Manchester. Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE CLASSICAL ELEMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Considered as a Proof of its Genuineness, with an Appendix on the Old Authorities used in the Formation of the Canon. By CHARLES H. HOOLE, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

MACMILLAN'S GREEK READER. Stories and Legends. A First Greek Reader. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises by F. H. COLSON, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Senior Classical Master at Bradford Grammar School. Globe 8vo, 3s.

MACMILLAN'S LATIN READER. A Latin Reader for the Lower Forms in Schools. By H. J. HARDY, M.A., Assistant Master in Winchester College. Globe 8vo, 2s. 6d.

MACMILLAN'S GREEK COURSE. Edited by the Rev. W. GUNION RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D., Head Master of Westminster.

I. First Greek Grammar. By Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D. New Edition, thoroughly revised. Globe 8vo, 2s.

II. Easy Lessons in Greek Accidence. By H. G. UNDERHILL, M.A., Assistant Master, St. Paul's Preparatory School. Globe 8vo, 2s.

. The aim of this series is to provide introductory manuals to the study of Greek which shall be based upon the soundest modern views of teaching the language, and shall satisfy modern requirements.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

In the press, 2 vols. Demy 8vo.

Dedicated by special permission to Her Majesty the Queen.

Life and Letters of the Rev. Adam Sedgwick, LL.D., F.R.S.,

Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Prebendary of Norwich, and Woodwardian Professor of Geology, from 1818 to 1873.
By JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., F.S.A., Superintendent of the University Museum of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and THOMAS McKENNY HUGHES, M.A., Woodwardian Professor of Geology.

The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge

AND OF THE COLLEGES OF CAMBRIDGE AND ETON. By the late ROBERT WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor in the University of Cambridge. Edited, with large Additions and brought up to the present time, by JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 4 vols. Super Royal 8vo. 26 6s.
Also a Limited Edition of the same, consisting of 120 Copies only, Large Paper Quarto; the Woodcuts and Steel Engravings mounted on India Paper. Price Twenty-five Guineas net each set.

In the press.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE DIVINA COMMEDIA. Including the Complete Collation throughout the "Inferno" of all the MSS. at Oxford and Cambridge. By the Rev. EDWARD MOORE, D.D., Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and Barlow Lecturer on Dante in the University of London.

In the press. demy 8vo.

THE HISTORY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT. Being the Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes. Edited from Five Manuscripts, with an English Translation and Notes. By ERNEST A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A., formerly Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Tyrwhitt Scholar, Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum.

Now ready.

OCCASIONAL ADDRESSES ON EDUCATIONAL SUBJECTS. By S. S. LAURENCE, A.M., LL.D., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo, 5s.

The Odyssey of Homer. Book IX. With Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by G. M. EDWARDS, M.A. 2s. 6d.

Euripides.—Bacchae. With Introduction, Critical Notes, and Archaeological Illustrations. By J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo, 12s. 6d.

—Hercules Furens. With Introduction, Notes and Analysis by A. GRAY, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, and J. T. HUTCHINSON, M.A., Christ's College. New Edition. 2s.

—Heracleidae. With Introduction and Critical Notes by E. A. BECK, M.A., Fellow of Trinity Hall. 3s. 6d.

Aristophanes.—Ranae, Aves, and Plutus. With English Notes and Introduction by W. C. GREEN, M.A. 3s. 6d. each.

Private Orations of Demosthenes. With Introductions and English Notes. By F. A. PALEY, M.A., and J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D.

Part I.—*Contra Phormionem, Laerium, Pantaneum, Boeotum de Nomine, Boeotum de Dote, Dionysodorum.* New Edition. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Part II.—*Pro Phormione. Contra Stephanum I. II.: Nicestratum, Cononem, Calliclem.* New Edition. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Demosthenes against Androtion and against TIMOCRATES. With Introductions and English Commentary. By W. WAYTE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Platonis Apologia Socratis. With Introduction, Notes and Appendices, by J. ADAM, B.A. 3s. 6d.

Platonis Crito. By the same Editor. 2s. 6d.

Plutarch.—Lives of the Gracchi and Life of SULLA. By Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D. 6s. each.

—Life of Nicias. Same Editor. 5s.

Herodotus. Book VIII., Chaps. 1—90, Book IX., Chaps. 1—9. Edited with Notes and Introduction by E. S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A., late Fellow of Emmanuel College. 3s. 6d. each.

Xenophon.—Cyropaedia. Books I. II. With Introduction, Notes, and Map. By Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D. 6s.

—Books III., IV., V. By the same Editor. 5s.

The Anabasis of Xenophon. Books I. III. IV. and V. With a Map and English Notes by A. PRETOR, M.A. 2s. each.

—Books II., VI., VII. By the same Editor. 2s. 6d. each.

P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri I.—XII. Edited with Notes, by A. SIDGWICK, M.A. 1s. 6d. each.

P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon. Libri I. II. By the same Editor. 2s.

Libri III., IV. By the same Editor. 2s.

P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica, with Introduction and Notes, by A. SIDGWICK, M.A. 1s. 6d. Or in Two Parts, Text and Notes separately, same price.

Horace.—Epistles. Book I. With Notes and Introduction by E. S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A., late Fellow of Emmanuel College. 2s. 6d.

Gaii Iulii Caesaris de Bello Gallico Comment I. AND III. With Maps and English Notes by A. G. PESKETT, M.A. 1s. 6d. each.

—**Comment. I., II., III.** By the same Editor. 3s.

—**Comment. IV. and V., and Comment. VII.,** by the same Editor. 2s. each.

—**Comment. VI. and Comment. VIII.,** by the same Editor, 1s. 6d. each.

Livy.—Book XXI. With Notes, Introduction and Maps: By M. S. DIMSDALE, M.A., Fellow of King's College. 3s. 6d.

M. T. Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres. With Marginal Analysis, an English Commentary, and Indices. Sixth Edition, Revised. By Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, 9s.

M. T. Ciceronis pro Cn. Plancio Oratio. Edited by Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

M. T. Ciceronis de Natura Deorum Libri Tres. With Introduction and Commentary by J. B. MAYOR, M.A. Together with a new collation of several of the English MSS. by J. H. SWANSON, M.A.

Vol. I., demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. Vol. II., 12s. 6d. Vol. III., 10s.

M. T. Ciceronis pro Sulla, de Senectute, and de AMICITIA. Edited by J. S. REID, Litt.D. 3s. 6d. each.

M. T. Ciceronis Oratio pro Archia Poeta. Edited by J. S. REID, Litt.D. Revised Edition. 2s.

M. T. Ciceronis pro L. Cornelio Balbo Oratio Edited by J. S. REID, Litt.D. 1s. 6d.

M. T. Ciceronis Oratio pro L. Murena. With English Introduction and Notes by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. Second Edition, carefully revised. 3s.

M. T. Ciceronis in Q. Caecilium Divinatio et in C. VERREM ACTIO PRIMA. With Introduction and Notes by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., and H. COWIE, M.A. 5s.

M. Tullii Ciceronis Oratio Philippica Secunda With Introduction and Notes by A. G. PESKETT, M.A. 3s. 6d.

COMPLETE CATALOGUES ON APPLICATION.

London: C. J. CLAY & SONS, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.
Glasgow: 263 Argyle Street.

The Classical Review

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
Shute on the History of the Aristotelian Writings. R. D. HICKS	305	NOTES (continued)—	
Roscher's <i>Lexicon of Mythology</i> (Roman). W. W. FOWLER	307	Pindar <i>Pyth. I.</i> 1. 'Ασράδ and αβράδ. R. C. SEATON	324
Old Latin Biblical Texts. T. K. ABBOTT	311	Aesch. <i>Ag.</i> 555. J. B. BURY	324
Müller's <i>Nonius</i> , Part I. J. H. ONIONS	314	Soph. <i>Phil.</i> 41. R. C. JEBB	324
Blaydes' <i>Plutus and Acharnians</i> . R. A. NEIL	317	Fragment of <i>Sophocles</i> . F. HAVERFIELD	324
Paley's <i>Suppliant Women of Euripides</i> . E. B. ENGLAND	318	Arist. <i>Av.</i> 194. F. H.	324
Hultsch's <i>Polybius</i> . Vol. I. J. L. STRACHAN-DAVIDSON	318	Plato <i>Rep.</i> 498 A. H. RICHARDS	324
Williams' <i>Translation of Lucian</i> . W. RHYS ROBERTS	320	St. Matt. xxvii. 14. L. DOWDALL	325
Von Arnim's <i>Quellen-studien zu Philo.</i> C. BIGG	320	Pausanias vii. 25. L. R. FARNELL	325
Asmus. <i>Quaestiones Epicteteae</i>	321	Epitaph at <i>Philegandros</i> . J. H. ABRAHAM	325
Howorth. <i>Pythagoras in India</i>	321	A <i>Phrygian Inscription</i> . W. M. RAMSAY	326
<i>Commentationes Philologae</i>	321	Plautus <i>Amphitr.</i> 1072. A. PALMER	326
Campbell's <i>Leptodendron Septentrionale</i> . E. D. STONE	321	Caesar <i>B.G.</i> viii. <i>praef.</i> 2. A. G. PESKETT	326
NOTES.		Juvenal x. 54; xiv. 24. H. RICHARDS	326
Hide-measured Lands. J. G. FRAZER	322	ARCHEOLOGY.	
Bedstead of the <i>Flamen Dialis</i> . J. G. F.	322	Various Notes. A. S. MURRAY	327
Μη prohibitive with <i>Fut. Ind.</i> R. WHITELAW	322	Notes from <i>Ceramus</i> . W. R. PATON	328
<i>Iliad</i> II. 354. J. E. NIXON	323	Notes from <i>Constantinople and Sirina</i> . J. T. BENT	329
		Acquisitions of the <i>British Museum</i>	329
		Baumeister's <i>Denkmäler</i> . W. WROTH	330
		Summaries of <i>Periodicals</i>	330
		Address to Dr. K. E. Georges, the <i>Lexicographer</i>	334
		<i>Bibliography</i>	335

London :

DAVID NUTT, 270, STRAND.

Paris.
F. VIEWEG.
CH. KLINCKESBECK.
Berlin.
ASHER AND CO.

Leipzig.
F. A. BROCKHAUS.
Strassburg.
K. J. TRÜDNER.

Halle.
M. NIKMEYER.
Tutin.
ERMANO LOESCHER.

Vienna.
GEROLD AND CO.
Milan.
U. HOEFL.

New York.
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.
Melbourne.
G. ROBERTSON AND CO.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence. Yearly Subscription (Ten Numbers), Eleven Shillings, Post Free.
The first and second numbers of Vol. III. will be issued together at the end of January, 1889.

PUBLIKATIONEN DER KÖNIGL. PREUSS. AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN.

Commissions-Verlag von GEORG REIMER in BERLIN.

Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin aus dem Jahre 1886. 4^o. Mk. 30.—

Hieraus apart:

a) Anhang: Abhandlungen nicht zur Akademie gehöriger Gelehrter. cart. Mk. 8.50

b) Physikalische Klasse. cart. Mk. 4.50

c) Histor.-Philolog. Klasse. cart. Mk. 14.—

Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Mittheilungen aus den Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Jahrgang 1887. Lex.-Octav 10 Hefte Mk. 8.—

Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Jahrgang 1887. Lex.-Octav. 54 Hefte Mk. 12.—

Gräber, Fr., Die Wasserleitungen von Perga non. Vorläufiger Bericht mit einem Beitrage von C. Schuchhardt. Mit 2 Tafeln. 4^o. Mk. 2.—

Hirschfeld, Gustav., Die Felsenreliefs in Kleinasien und das Volk der Hittiter. Zweiter Beitrag zur Kunstgeschichte Kleinasien. Mit 2 Tafeln und 15 Abbildungen im Text. 4^o. cart. Mk. 4.50.

Kötter, E., Grundzüge einer rein geometrischen Theorie der algebraischen ebenen Curven. Gekrönte Preisschrift. 4^o. Mk. 20.—

Nöldeke, Th., Die Ghassânischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafna's. 4^o. Mk. 4.—

Rawits, B., Die Fussdrüse der Opistobranchier. Mit 2 Tafeln. 4^o. cart. Mk. 2.—

Schmidt, Joh., Gedächtnissrede auf Wilhelm Scherer. 4^o. Mk. 1.—

Schulze, F. E., Zur Stammesgeschichte der Hexactinelliden. 4^o. Mk. 1.50

Weber, A., Ueber den Parasiprakāça des Krishnadāsa. 4^o. Mk. 8.—

Contributors from January, 1887 to March, 1888.

T. K. ABBOTT.
J. HOSKYNs ABRAHAM.
W. C. F. ANDERSON.
E. V. ARNOLD.
J. B. BURY.
S. H. BUTCHER.
F. CARTER.
A. J. CHURCH.
F. T. COLBY.
J. C. COLLINS.
A. M. COOK.
A. H. COOKE.
CHR. COOKSON.
A. W. W. DALE.
H. D. DARBISHIRE.
M. C. DAWES.
Sir G. DENMAN.
J. D. DUFF.
G. M. EDWARDS.
ROBINSON ELLIS.
E. B. ENGLAND.
ARTHUR J. EVANS.
W. W. FOWLER.
H. FURNEAUX.
P. GILES.
M. G. GLAZEBROOK.
A. GOODWIN.
J. GOW.
C. E. GRAVES.
M. G. GWATKIN.
H. HAGER.
E. G. HARDY.
J. RENDEL HARRIS.
F. HAVERFIELD.
T. L. HEATH.
C. B. HEBERDEN.
W. E. HEITLAND.
J. H. HESSELS.
E. L. HICKS.
R. D. HICKS.
R. D. ARCHER-HIND.
A. E. HOUSMAN.
M. R. JAMES.

R. C. JEDR.
F. B. JEVONS.
B. H. KENNEDY.
J. E. KING.
W. LEAF.
W. M. LINDSAY.
J. H. LUFTON.
R. W. MACAN.
J. W. MACKAIL.
H. MACNAGHTEN.
J. B. MAYOR.
J. E. B. MAYOR.
C. MERK.
W. W. MERRY.
D. B. MONRO.
E. D. A. MORSHEAD.
A. S. MURRAY.
H. NETTLESHIP.
J. E. NIXON.
C. W. C. OMAN.
J. H. ONIONS.
S. G. OWEN.
T. E. PAGE.
A. PALLIS.
A. PALMER.
W. R. PATON.
A. C. PEARSON.
J. PEILE.
H. F. PELHAM.
A. G. PESKETT.
J. A. PLATT.
A. PLUMMER.
R. STUART POOLE.
J. P. POSTGATE.
L. C. PURSER.
W. M. RAMSAY.
T. RANDELL.
D. RANKIN.
J. S. RIND.
S. REINACH.
H. P. RICHARDS.
W. RIDGEWAY.
E. S. ROBERTS.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.
E. S. ROBERTSON.
J. A. ROBINSON.
H. J. ROBY.
W. G. RUTHERFORD.
W. SANDAY.
J. E. SANDYS.
J. M. SCHULHOF.
R. C. SEATON.
W. Y. SELLAR.
E. S. SHUCKBURGH.
A. SIDGWICK.
A. H. SMITH.
C. SMITH.
W. ROBERTSON SMITH.
T. C. SNOW.
E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.
H. B. STANWELL.
H. M. STEPHENSON.
E. D. STONE.
E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.
V. THOMPSON.
A. TILLEY.
C. TORR.
H. F. TOZER.
T. G. TUCKER.
R. Y. TYRRELL.
A. W. VERRALL.
F. W. WALKER.
G. C. WARR.
W. WAYTE.
E. R. WHARTON.
J. R. WHEELER.
L. WHIBLEY.
R. WHITELAW.
E. C. WICKHAM.
A. S. WILKINS.
Bp. C. WORDSWORTH.
CHR. WORDSWORTH.
W. WROTE.
W. WYSE.
T. ZIEGLER.

D. NUTT, 270 STRAND.

TO BE ISSUED IMMEDIATELY

An Egyptian Reading Book.

COMPILED BY

E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A.

Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. The Tale of Two Brothers	1—25
II. The Possessed Princess of Bechten	26—30
III. The Festival Songs of Isis and Nephthys	30—45
IV. Colophon	45—46
V. The Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys	46—51
VI. The Litanies of Seker	52—57
VII. The Inscription of Una	58—63
VIII. The Inscription of Chnemu-Hetep	64—70
IX. Inscriptions on the Base of the Obelisk of Hat Shepsu	70—73
X. Stelae of Necht-Amsu	74—78
XI. The Battle of Kadesh	78—72
XII. Annals of Rameses III.	82—108
XIII. The Stelae of Pi-Anchi-Meri-Amen	108—129
XIV. The Decree of Canopus	129—137
XV. The Precepts of Kakemna	138—139
XVI. The Precepts of Ptah-Hetep	140—157
XVII. The Travels of an Egyptian	157—169
XVIII. Hymn to Amen-Ra	169—176
XIX. The Spoliation of the Tombs	177—194

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 10s. 6d. Net.

The *Archæological Review* for December contains the following articles: "The Dedication of Churches," by **Edward Peacock**; "The Distinction between Gothic and Romanesque," by **Edward Bell**; "Ethnographical Museums," Translated from the Danish of **Dr. Christian Bahnson** by **H. F. Morland Simpson**; "A Witch Trial, temp. Elizabeth;" "Subject Indices to the Old English Drama, No. 4, George Chapman's May Day," &c. 80 pages, Royal 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Vol. I. of the *Archæological Review* is now ready (March—August, 1888). With Full Indices and Supplement Index of Archæological Papers prior to 1886. A Roy. 8vo. Volume of xxiv., 456, 32 pages, Handsomely Bound in Cloth, 10s. 6d.

NOW READY,

Small 8vo, Cloth, Price Two Shillings. Large Paper Copies, Demy 8vo, Cloth, Five Shillings.

THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL: Its Duties and Powers, According to the Local Government Act of 1888, incorporating the duties transferred from the Metropolitan Board of Works and Other Bodies. By **GEORGE LAURENCE GOMME, F.S.A.**, Author of "Index of Municipal Offices," "Literature of Local Institutions," "Primitive Folkmoths," "Early Municipal History of London," &c.

LIST No. VIII. Old and Second Hand Theology, chiefly Roman Catholic (comprising large selections from the stock of **Mr. JOHN MOZLEY STARK**). 325 Numbers. Post free on application.

CLARENDON PRESS NEW CLASSICAL BOOKS.

NEW EDITION OF PROFESSOR JOWETT'S TRANSLATION OF PLATO'S REPUBLIC.
Just published. Third Edition revised and corrected throughout. Medium 8vo, cloth, 12s. 6d.; half roan, gilt top, 14s.
PLATO.—THE REPUBLIC. Translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction by B. JOWETT, M.A., Master of Balliol College, and Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford.
* The additions and alterations, both in the Introduction and the Text of this edition, affect at least a third of the work.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.
PLATO.—THE DIALOGUES. Translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction. New Edition, 5 vols., 8vo, cloth, £3 10s.

THUCYDIDES. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. Two vols., 8vo, cloth, 32s.

ARISTOTLE.—THE POLITICS. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Essays, Notes, and Indices. Vols. I. and II., 8vo, cloth. Vol. I., containing the Introduction and Translation. Vol. II, Part I., containing the Notes, 21s.

"The most agreeable and helpful English version"—*Pall Mall Gazette*.
COMPLETION OF MR. MONRO'S SCHOOL EDITION OF HOMER'S ILIAD.
Just published. Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 6s.

HOMER.—ILIAD. BOOKS XIII.—XXIV. (for Schools). With an Introduction, a brief Homeric Grammar, and Notes, by D. B. MONRO, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, Author of a "Grammar of the Homeric Dialect."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.
Second Edition, Revised and Corrected, Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 6s.
HOMER.—ILIAD. BOOKS I.—XII. (for Schools). With an Introduction, a brief Homeric Grammar, and Notes, by D. B. MONRO, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, Author of a "Grammar of the Homeric Dialect." Book I. separately, 2s.

"Will supersede, as it deserves to supersede, all its predecessors."—*St. James's Gazette*.
"Fulfills its purpose admirably, and is certainly the best school edition of any portion of the works of Homer that has come under our notice."—*Saturday Review*.

"Like all Mr. Monro's work on Homer, it is excellently done, and will be of great use to schoolmasters."—*Academy*.
EURIPIDES.—HERACLEIDAE. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. S. JERRAM, M.A., Editor of Euripides, "Helena," "Alceste," "Iphigenia in Tauris"; Virgil, "Bucolics," "Æneid," Book I., "Anglice Reddenda," &c.

Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s.
XENOPHON.—HELLENICA. BOOKS I., II. With Introduction and Notes by G. E. UNDERHILL, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College.

Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
XENOPHON'S ANABASIS. BOOK III. With Introduction, Notes, &c., by J. MARSHALL, M.A., Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh.
UNIFORM WITH SARGENT'S PASSAGES OF LATIN PROSE.

Just published, fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s.
PASSAGES FOR TRANSLATION INTO GREEK. By J. Y. SARGENT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
A LATIN PROSE PRIMER. By J. Y. SARGENT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

Intended to be used as a Companion to "Easy Passages for Translation into Latin" (Seventh Edition), by the same Author. The plan adopted is to start from the simplest form of sentence, and proceed gradually to continuous narrative.

Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s.
AN INTRODUCTION TO LATIN SYNTAX. By W. S. GIBSON, M.A., late Exhibitor of Balliol College, Oxford.

Instead of beginning with an abstract rule to be learned, each Section begins with a Latin sentence or sentences illustrative of the rule which is to be explained. The master should see that the pupil is able to translate these sentences word for word, and to parse every word in them. It is hoped that the plan of giving a separate Vocabulary for each part of speech may have the effect of obliging the pupil to think before looking out a word.

Just published, Third Edition, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, in One or Two Parts, 3s.
CORNELIUS NEPOS. With English Notes by OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Third Edition, Revised by W. R. INGE, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master at Eton.

SUBJECT FOR THE OXFORD LOCAL EXAMINATIONS, 1889.
Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s.
CÆSAR.—THE GALLIC WAR. BOOKS I. and II. (for Schools). With Notes and Maps by C. E. MOBERLY, M.A., formerly Assistant Master at Rugby.

"Stands high among the best classics we have met."—*Saturday Review*.
Just published, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

LIVY.—BOOK XXII. With Introduction and Notes by M. T. TATHAM, M.A.
"A thoroughly good school book. The notes are short and to the point, such as boys will read."—*Saturday Review*.
NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION OF THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY CALENDAR. Just published, Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY CALENDAR FOR THE YEAR 1889.
* This book has been restored in many respects to the shape which it bore in the years immediately preceding 1863. The entire Series of CLASS LISTS and HONOUR LISTS are again inserted from their commencement; and the Names and Colleges of the Winners of the University Scholarships, Exhibitions, and Prizes, in most cases from the foundation of each, are also given.
A SUPPLEMENT TO THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY CALENDAR.

Just published, Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.
THE HISTORICAL REGISTER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.
Being a Supplement to the University Calendar, with an Alphabetical Record of University Honours and Distinctions, completed to the end of Trinity Term, 1888.

* A special feature of the REGISTER is the ALPHABETICAL INDEX to University Honours, in which will be found the name of every Graduate who has received any University distinction from the foundation of the University, with a list of the Offices or Honours attained by him, thus giving a complete record of his academical career.

Full Clarendon Press Catalogues free on application.

London: HENRY FROWDE, CLARENDON PRESS WAREHOUSE, Amen Corner, E.C.

BEWARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BURGAY.

